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### 1NC – Competitiveness [L]

#### Donations to colleges growing at rapid rate – survey of 983 colleges proves

Lederman 16 [Doug Lederman (editor, co-founder of Inside Higher Ed), "In Giving to Colleges, the One Percenters Gain," Inside Higher Ed, 1/27/2016] AZ

The Council for Aid to Education's study is one of a handful of annual reports (along with today's on endowments, last week's on state support for higher education, and some others) that provide a baseline sense of the state of higher education finances. The survey drew fund-raising information from 983 institutions, and it extrapolates from those results to estimate total giving for 3,900 colleges and universities. The 7.6 percent rise revealed for 2015 by the council's survey, which followed a 10.8 percent gain from 2013 to 2014, was driven largely by giving from individuals (alumni and not), which increased sharply. Donations from foundations and corporations, meanwhile, were either modest or flat, as seen in the table below. Continuing a trend of recent years, the amount of money donated by alumni rose sharply, by 10.2 percent, to $10.85 billion, but the proportion of alumni who contributed fell to 8.4 percent, from 8.6 percent. (It was 11.7 percent in 2007.) Ann E. Kaplan, who directs the survey, attributed the decline mostly to the fact that digital and other technologies are helping colleges track down more alumni. "Participation will only increase if the number of donors rises more than the number of located alumni," Kaplan said in a news release. "This is unlikely in a technological age in which individuals may have multiple means of contact that make them easy to locate. Finding an address is much simpler than cultivating a relationship that leads to a contribution." Giving by nonalumni individuals (donors, parents, etc.) rose by more than any other category, 23.1 percent. Donations for current operations (as opposed to capital purposes) rose by 13.1 percent in fiscal 2015, while funds for endowments, facilities and other purposes were flat. The study attributes the latter result to the fact that there was a huge -- 23.3 percent -- rise the previous year (fiscal 2014) in gifts to restricted endowments, which is the largest category of capital purposes. That kind of donation tends to track the stock market, which was stronger in 2014 than in 2015.

#### Administrators need the ability to regulate speech to maintain donations

Press and Student Nation ‘16 [ALEX PRESS is a PhD student in sociology based in Boston. STUDENTNATION First-person accounts from student activists, organizers and journalists reporting on youth-oriented movements for social justice, economic equality and tolerance. “Silence on Campus: Contingent Work and Free Speech.” The Nation. February 17, 2016. https://www.thenation.com/article/silence-on-campus-contingent-work-and-free-speech/ JJN]

﻿Corporatization creates a dilemma for higher education: College, unlike most businesses, serves a social function—the production and transfer of knowledge—the achievement of which requires an environment of intellectual freedom that can conflict with profit margins, as some actors central to the model, such as donors, may take issue with controversial speech. In the past, tenure resolved some of this tension—once professors gain tenure, they’re walled off from these pressures, at least theoretically. With the erosion of tenure and a slack academic job market, free speech disappears as professors become increasingly disposable. As Steven Vallas, a sociologist at Northeastern University who researches the changing nature of work, argues, a professor’s right to speak freely presumes a foundation of job stability. “If you have an expansion of the adjunct, precarious professoriate, than you really are eroding the proportion of people who can speak their mind.” In contrast to claims that censorious students are the central threat to the ability of college to serve as a marketplace of ideas, the silencing of speech that comes with a sense of one’s disposability appears much more powerful. Conceding the difficulty of capturing the preemptive stifling of debate that comes with disposable worker status, we can take the severity of repercussions visited upon those who don’t censor themselves as indicative of the problem. Take the case of Steven Salaita, an indigenous studies scholar whose offer of a position at the University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign was rescinded after he tweeted critically about Israel’s 2014 attack on Gaza. A violation of academic freedom that resulted in a rare formal censure from the AAUP, for Salaita, administrative censorship is no secret. “For the uninitiated, the levels of vitriol and retribution that attend criticism of Israel can be stunning,” he writes, referencing a report authored by the Center for Constitutional Rights and Palestine Legal that details hundreds of reported acts of suppression of pro-Palestine advocacy in under two years. Salaita sued the University of Illinois for violating his rights. While he settled out of court for $875,000, discovery findings from his lawsuit reveal the likelihood of donor influence on the decision to fire him, with the chancellor communicating with donors about Salaita’s tweets and his possible dismissal. As Salaita’s case demonstrates, the extent of donor pressure goes a long way to explain why administrations might choose to silence speech, explains William Robinson, a professor at the University of California–Santa Barbara. In 2009, Robinson caught the attention of outside organizations that then pressured UCSB administrators to charge him with violating the university’s academic code of conduct, according to Robinson’s account of the incident, as well as details published by his supporters. Explaining the role financial needs play in decisions to censor faculty in public higher education, Robinson argues, “As public funding is cut, the administration becomes more reliant on private donors. These donors then use that leverage, threatening to withdraw donations if an administration doesn’t act.” The problem is worsening as public funds for higher education are drying up across the country, according to a recent report by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. As this money dwindles, administrations turn to wealthy donors, creating the conditions under which prestigious donors can sway administrator’s decisions on how to respond to controversial faculty, if those faculty can get hired in the first place.

#### Endowment funds are key to US competitiveness – ensures college quality

Leigh 14 [Steven R. Leigh (dean of CU-Boulder’s College of Arts and Sciences), "Endowments and the future of higher education," UColorado Boulder, March 2014] AZ

These broad trends point directly to the need for CU-Boulder’s College of Arts and Sciences to increase endowment funding across the college. Endowments drive improvements in the quality of an institution and reflect alums, donors and supporters who recognize the importance of research universities in the 21st century. Endowed professorships are the first and most important component of increasing our academic quality. Named chairs recognize significant faculty achievements and help the university support faculty salary and research. CU-Boulder professors are among the most productive in the nation and are heavily recruited by competitors, including Harvard, Yale, Stanford, Cornell, Berkeley, Illinois, UC Irvine and many others. Often, these competitors offer our faculty endowed professorships, conferring prestige and research support. CU must provide its faculty with comparable support to be competitive. A second major area for endowments is student scholarships and, for graduate students, fellowships. A stable source of income that helps pay tuition is the most direct and effective way to offset the costs of education. Endowed scholarships are also effective recruiting tools for admitting the nation’s best to CU. Our dynamic programs, departments and majors are attracting more and more applicants, including the best in the nation. Like faculty support, endowed scholarships and fellowships confer prestige and, most importantly, allow students to focus entirely on academics without balancing jobs and worrying about future loan repayments. Finally, endowment funding for programs greatly enriches the institution, providing capabilities that are difficult to attain when tuition revenue provides the majority of funding. Institutions funded mainly by tuition must make sure that expenditures directly benefit students, which sometimes limits options for innovation and risk-taking. Programmatic funding enables faculty and students to take risks in their research and creative work. For example, in my own field, this might involve traveling to an unexplored region to prospect for human fossils or archaeological sites. Support for high-risk projects allows our faculty and students to develop new areas of knowledge, benefitting society by broadening the capacity of the institution to innovate. The future of higher education, including CU’s future, depends to a large degree on how successfully we can build major endowments. Ultimately, U.S. competitiveness and leadership in the global knowledge economy depends on this as well. For alums, donors and supporters, endowments indelibly affirm the importance of higher education and enduringly preserve its viability and vitality.

#### Innovation solves great power war

Taylor 4 – Professor of Political Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (Mark, “The Politics of Technological Change: International Relations versus Domestic Institutions,” Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 4/1/2004, <http://www.scribd.com/doc/46554792/Taylor>) //RGP

I. Introduction Technological innovation is of central importance to the study of international relations (IR), affecting almost every aspect of the sub-field. First and foremost, a nation’s technological capability has a significant effect on its economic growth, industrial might, and military prowess; therefore relative national technological capabilities necessarily influence the balance of power between states, and hence have a role in calculations of war and alliance formation. Second, technology and innovative capacity also determine a nation’s trade profile, affecting which products it will import and export, as well as where multinational corporations will base their production facilities. Third, insofar as innovation-driven economic growth both attracts investment and produces surplus capital, a nation’s technological ability will also affect international financial flows and who has power over them. Thus, in broad theoretical terms, technological change is important to the study of IR because of its overall implications for both the relative and absolute power of states. And if theory alone does not convince, then history also tells us that nations on the technological ascent generally experience a corresponding and dramatic change in their global stature and influence, such as Britain during the first industrial revolution, the United States and Germany during the second industrial revolution, and Japan during the twentieth century. Conversely, great powers which fail to maintain their place at the technological frontier generally drift and fade from influence on international scene. This is not to suggest that technological innovation alone determines international politics, but rather that shifts in both relative and absolute technological capability have a major impact on international relations, and therefore need to be better understood by IR scholars. Indeed, the importance of technological innovation to international relations is seldom disputed by IR theorists. Technology is rarely the sole or overriding causal variable in any given IR theory, but a broad overview of the major theoretical debates reveals the ubiquity of technological causality. For example, from Waltz to Posen, almost all Realists have a place for technology in their explanations of international politics. At the very least, they describe it as an essential part of the distribution of material capabilities across nations, or an indirect source of military doctrine. And for some, like Gilpin quoted above, technology is the very cornerstone of great power domination, and its transfer the main vehicle by which war and change occur in world politics. Jervis tells us that the balance of offensive and defensive military technology affects the incentives for war. Walt agrees, arguing that technological change can alter a state’s aggregate power, and thereby affect both alliance formation and the international balance of threats. Liberals are less directly concerned with technological change, but they must admit that by raising or lowering the costs of using force, technological progress affects the rational attractiveness of international cooperation and regimes. Technology also lowers information & transactions costs and thus increases the applicability of international institutions, a cornerstone of Liberal IR theory. And in fostering flows of trade, finance, and information, technological change can lead to Keohane’s interdependence or Thomas Friedman et al’s globalization. Meanwhile, over at the “third debate”, Constructivists cover the causal spectrum on the issue, from Katzenstein’s “cultural norms” which shape security concerns and thereby affect technological innovation; to Wendt’s “stripped down technological determinism” in which technology inevitably drives nations to form a world state. However most Constructivists seem to favor Wendt, arguing that new technology changes people’s identities within society, and sometimes even creates new cross-national constituencies, thereby affecting international politics. Of course, Marxists tend to see technology as determining all social relations and the entire course of history, though they describe mankind’s major fault lines as running between economic classes rather than nation-states. Finally, Buzan & Little remind us that without advances in the technologies of transportation, communication, production, and war, international systems would not exist in the first place.

#### US leadership prevents great power war and existential governance crises

Brooks, Ikenberry, and Wohlforth ’13 (Stephen, Associate Professor of Government at Dartmouth College, John Ikenberry is the Albert G. Milbank Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University in the Department of Politics and the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, William C. Wohlforth is the Daniel Webster Professor in the Department of Government at Dartmouth College “Don’t Come Home America: The Case Against Retrenchment,” International Security, Vol. 37, No. 3 (Winter 2012/13), pp. 7–51)

A core premise of deep engagement is that it prevents the emergence of a far more dangerous global security environment. For one thing, as noted above, the United States’ overseas presence gives it the leverage to restrain partners from taking provocative action. Perhaps more important, its core alliance commitments also deter states with aspirations to regional hegemony from contemplating expansion and make its partners more secure, reducing their incentive to adopt solutions to their security problems that threaten others and thus stoke security dilemmas. The contention that engaged U.S. power dampens the baleful effects of anarchy is consistent with influential variants of realist theory. Indeed, arguably the scariest portrayal of the war-prone world that would emerge absent the “American Pacifier” is provided in the works of John Mearsheimer, who forecasts dangerous multipolar regions replete with security competition, arms races, nuclear proliferation and associated preventive war temptations, regional rivalries, and even runs at regional hegemony and full-scale great power war. 72 How do retrenchment advocates, the bulk of whom are realists, discount this benefit? Their arguments are complicated, but two capture most of the variation: (1) U.S. security guarantees are not necessary to prevent dangerous rivalries and conflict in Eurasia; or (2) prevention of rivalry and conflict in Eurasia is not a U.S. interest. Each response is connected to a different theory or set of theories, which makes sense given that the whole debate hinges on a complex future counterfactual (what would happen to Eurasia’s security setting if the United States truly disengaged?). Although a certain answer is impossible, each of these responses is nonetheless a weaker argument for retrenchment than advocates acknowledge. The first response flows from defensive realism as well as other international relations theories that discount the conflict-generating potential of anarchy under contemporary conditions. 73 Defensive realists maintain that the high expected costs of territorial conquest, defense dominance, and an array of policies and practices that can be used credibly to signal benign intent, mean that Eurasia’s major states could manage regional multipolarity peacefully without the American pacifier. Retrenchment would be a bet on this scholarship, particularly in regions where the kinds of stabilizers that nonrealist theories point to—such as democratic governance or dense institutional linkages—are either absent or weakly present. There are three other major bodies of scholarship, however, that might give decisionmakers pause before making this bet. First is regional expertise. Needless to say, there is no consensus on the net security effects of U.S. withdrawal. Regarding each region, there are optimists and pessimists. Few experts expect a return of intense great power competition in a post-American Europe, but many doubt European governments will pay the political costs of increased EU defense cooperation and the budgetary costs of increasing military outlays. 74 The result might be a Europe that is incapable of securing itself from various threats that could be destabilizing within the region and beyond (e.g., a regional conflict akin to the 1990s Balkan wars), lacks capacity for global security missions in which U.S. leaders might want European participation, and is vulnerable to the influence of outside rising powers. What about the other parts of Eurasia where the United States has a substantial military presence? Regarding the Middle East, the balance begins to swing toward pessimists concerned that states currently backed by Washington— notably Israel, Egypt, and Saudi Arabia—might take actions upon U.S. retrenchment that would intensify security dilemmas. And concerning East Asia, pessimism regarding the region’s prospects without the American pacifier is pronounced. Arguably the principal concern expressed by area experts is that Japan and South Korea are likely to obtain a nuclear capacity and increase their military commitments, which could stoke a destabilizing reaction from China. It is notable that during the Cold War, both South Korea and Taiwan moved to obtain a nuclear weapons capacity and were only constrained from doing so by a still-engaged United States. 75 The second body of scholarship casting doubt on the bet on defensive realism’s sanguine portrayal is all of the research that undermines its conception of state preferences. Defensive realism’s optimism about what would happen if the United States retrenched is very much dependent on its particular—and highly restrictive—assumption about state preferences; once we relax this assumption, then much of its basis for optimism vanishes. Specifically, the prediction of post-American tranquility throughout Eurasia rests on the assumption that security is the only relevant state preference, with security defined narrowly in terms of protection from violent external attacks on the homeland. Under that assumption, the security problem is largely solved as soon as offense and defense are clearly distinguishable, and offense is extremely expensive relative to defense. Burgeoning research across the social and other sciences, however, undermines that core assumption: states have preferences not only for security but also for prestige, status, and other aims, and they engage in trade-offs among the various objectives. 76 In addition, they define security not just in terms of territorial protection but in view of many and varied milieu goals. It follows that even states that are relatively secure may nevertheless engage in highly competitive behavior. Empirical studies show that this is indeed sometimes the case. 77 In sum, a bet on a benign postretrenchment Eurasia is a bet that leaders of major countries will never allow these nonsecurity preferences to influence their strategic choices. To the degree that these bodies of scholarly knowledge have predictive leverage, U.S. retrenchment would result in a significant deterioration in the security environment in at least some of the world’s key regions. We have already mentioned the third, even more alarming body of scholarship. Offensive realism predicts that the withdrawal of the American pacifier will yield either a competitive regional multipolarity complete with associated insecurity, arms racing, crisis instability, nuclear proliferation, and the like, or bids for regional hegemony, which may be beyond the capacity of local great powers to contain (and which in any case would generate intensely competitive behavior, possibly including regional great power war). Hence it is unsurprising that retrenchment advocates are prone to focus on the second argument noted above: that avoiding wars and security dilemmas in the world’s core regions is not a U.S. national interest. Few doubt that the United States could survive the return of insecurity and conflict among Eurasian powers, but at what cost? Much of the work in this area has focused on the economic externalities of a renewed threat of insecurity and war, which we discuss below. Focusing on the pure security ramifications, there are two main reasons why decisionmakers may be rationally reluctant to run the retrenchment experiment. First, overall higher levels of conflict make the world a more dangerous place. Were Eurasia to return to higher levels of interstate military competition, one would see overall higher levels of military spending and innovation and a higher likelihood of competitive regional proxy wars and arming of client states—all of which would be concerning, in part because it would promote a faster diffusion of military power away from the United States. Greater regional insecurity could well feed proliferation cascades, as states such as Egypt, Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, and Saudi Arabia all might choose to create nuclear forces. 78 It is unlikely that proliferation decisions by any of these actors would be the end of the game: they would likely generate pressure locally for more proliferation. Following Kenneth Waltz, many retrenchment advocates are proliferation optimists, assuming that nuclear deterrence solves the security problem. 79 Usually carried out in dyadic terms, the debate over the stability of proliferationchanges as the numbers go up. Proliferation optimism rests on assumptions of rationality and narrow security preferences. In social science, however, such assumptions are inevitably probabilistic. Optimists assume that most states are led by rational leaders, most will overcome organizational problems and resist the temptation to preempt before feared neighbors nuclearize, and most pursue only security and are risk averse. Confidence in such probabilistic assumptions declines if the world were to move from nine to twenty, thirty, or forty nuclear states. In addition, many of the other dangers noted by analysts who are concerned about the destabilizing effects of nuclear proliferation—including the risk of accidents and the prospects that some new nuclear powers will not have truly survivable forces—seem prone to go up as the number of nuclear powers grows. 80 Moreover, the risk of “unforeseen crisis dynamics” that could spin out of control is also higher as the number of nuclear powers increases. Finally, add to these concerns the enhanced danger of nuclear leakage, and a world with overall higher levels of security competition becomes yet more worrisome. The argument that maintaining Eurasian peace is not a U.S. interest faces a second problem. On widely accepted realist assumptions, acknowledging that U.S. engagement preserves peace dramatically narrows the difference between retrenchment and deep engagement. For many supporters of retrenchment, the optimal strategy for a power such as the United States, which has attained regional hegemony and is separated from other great powers by oceans, is offshore balancing: stay over the horizon and “pass the buck” to local powers to do the dangerous work of counterbalancing any local rising power. The United States should commit to onshore balancing only when local balancing is likely to fail and a great power appears to be a credible contender for regional hegemony, as in the cases of Germany, Japan, and the Soviet Union in the midtwentieth century. The problem is that China’s rise puts the possibility of its attaining regional hegemony on the table, at least in the medium to long term. As Mearsheimer notes, “The United States will have to play a key role in countering China, because its Asian neighbors are not strong enough to do it by themselves.” 81 Therefore, unless China’s rise stalls, “the United States is likely to act toward China similar to the way it behaved toward the Soviet Union during the Cold War.” 82 It follows that the United States should take no action that would compromise its capacity to move to onshore balancing in the future. It will need to maintain key alliance relationships in Asia as well as the formidably expensive military capacity to intervene there. The implication is to get out of Iraq and Afghanistan, reduce the presence in Europe, and pivot to Asia— just what the United States is doing. 83 In sum, the argument that U.S. security commitments are unnecessary **for peace** is countered by a lot of scholarship, including highly influential realist scholarship. In addition, the argument that Eurasian peace is unnecessary for U.S. security is weakened by the potential for a large number of nasty security consequences as well as the need to retain a latent onshore balancing capacity that dramatically reduces the savings retrenchment might bring. Moreover, switching between offshore and onshore balancing could well be difªcult. Bringing together the thrust of many of the arguments discussed so far underlines the degree to which the case for retrenchment misses the underlying logic of the deep engagement strategy. By supplying reassurance, deterrence, and active management, the United States lowers security competition in the world’s key regions, thereby preventing the emergence of a hothouse atmosphere for growing new military capabilities. Alliance ties dissuade partners from ramping up and also provide leverage to prevent military transfers to potential rivals. On top of all this, the United States’ formidable military machine may deter entry by potential rivals. Current great power military expenditures as a percentage of GDP are at historical lows, and thus far other major powers have shied away from seeking to match top-end U.S. military capabilities. In addition, they have so far been careful to avoid attracting the “focused enmity” of the United States. 84 All of the world’s most modern militaries are U.S. allies (America’s alliance system of more than sixty countries now accounts for some 80 percent of global military spending), and the gap between the U.S. military capability and that of potential rivals is by many measures growing rather than shrinking. 85

### 1NC – Competitiveness [S]

#### Donations to colleges growing

Lederman 16 [Doug Lederman (editor, co-founder of Inside Higher Ed), "In Giving to Colleges, the One Percenters Gain," Inside Higher Ed, 1/27/2016] AZ

The Council for Aid to Education's study is one of a handful of annual reports (along with today's on endowments, last week's on state support for higher education, and some others) that provide a baseline sense of the state of higher education finances. The survey drew fund-raising information from 983 institutions, and it extrapolates from those results to estimate total giving for 3,900 colleges and universities. The 7.6 percent rise revealed for 2015 by the council's survey, which followed a 10.8 percent gain from 2013 to 2014, was driven largely by giving from individuals (alumni and not), which increased sharply. Donations from foundations and corporations, meanwhile, were either modest or flat, as seen in the table below. Continuing a trend of recent years, the amount of money donated by alumni rose sharply, by 10.2 percent, to $10.85 billion, but the proportion of alumni who contributed fell to 8.4 percent, from 8.6 percent. (It was 11.7 percent in 2007.) Ann E. Kaplan, who directs the survey, attributed the decline mostly to the fact that digital and other technologies are helping colleges track down more alumni. "Participation will only increase if the number of donors rises more than the number of located alumni," Kaplan said in a news release. "This is unlikely in a technological age in which individuals may have multiple means of contact that make them easy to locate. Finding an address is much simpler than cultivating a relationship that leads to a contribution." Giving by nonalumni individuals (donors, parents, etc.) rose by more than any other category, 23.1 percent. Donations for current operations (as opposed to capital purposes) rose by 13.1 percent in fiscal 2015, while funds for endowments, facilities and other purposes were flat. The study attributes the latter result to the fact that there was a huge -- 23.3 percent -- rise the previous year (fiscal 2014) in gifts to restricted endowments, which is the largest category of capital purposes. That kind of donation tends to track the stock market, which was stronger in 2014 than in 2015.

#### Administrators need the ability to regulate speech to maintain donations

Press and Student Nation ‘16 [ALEX PRESS is a PhD student in sociology based in Boston. STUDENTNATION First-person accounts from student activists, organizers and journalists reporting on youth-oriented movements for social justice, economic equality and tolerance. “Silence on Campus: Contingent Work and Free Speech.” The Nation. February 17, 2016. https://www.thenation.com/article/silence-on-campus-contingent-work-and-free-speech/ JJN]

﻿Corporatization creates a dilemma for higher education: College, unlike most businesses, serves a social function—the production and transfer of knowledge—the achievement of which requires an environment of intellectual freedom that can conflict with profit margins, as some actors central to the model, such as donors, may take issue with controversial speech. In the past, tenure resolved some of this tension—once professors gain tenure, they’re walled off from these pressures, at least theoretically. With the erosion of tenure and a slack academic job market, free speech disappears as professors become increasingly disposable. As Steven Vallas, a sociologist at Northeastern University who researches the changing nature of work, argues, a professor’s right to speak freely presumes a foundation of job stability. “If you have an expansion of the adjunct, precarious professoriate, than you really are eroding the proportion of people who can speak their mind.” In contrast to claims that censorious students are the central threat to the ability of college to serve as a marketplace of ideas, the silencing of speech that comes with a sense of one’s disposability appears much more powerful. Conceding the difficulty of capturing the preemptive stifling of debate that comes with disposable worker status, we can take the severity of repercussions visited upon those who don’t censor themselves as indicative of the problem. Take the case of Steven Salaita, an indigenous studies scholar whose offer of a position at the University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign was rescinded after he tweeted critically about Israel’s 2014 attack on Gaza. A violation of academic freedom that resulted in a rare formal censure from the AAUP, for Salaita, administrative censorship is no secret. “For the uninitiated, the levels of vitriol and retribution that attend criticism of Israel can be stunning,” he writes, referencing a report authored by the Center for Constitutional Rights and Palestine Legal that details hundreds of reported acts of suppression of pro-Palestine advocacy in under two years. Salaita sued the University of Illinois for violating his rights. While he settled out of court for $875,000, discovery findings from his lawsuit reveal the likelihood of donor influence on the decision to fire him, with the chancellor communicating with donors about Salaita’s tweets and his possible dismissal. As Salaita’s case demonstrates, the extent of donor pressure goes a long way to explain why administrations might choose to silence speech, explains William Robinson, a professor at the University of California–Santa Barbara. In 2009, Robinson caught the attention of outside organizations that then pressured UCSB administrators to charge him with violating the university’s academic code of conduct, according to Robinson’s account of the incident, as well as details published by his supporters. Explaining the role financial needs play in decisions to censor faculty in public higher education, Robinson argues, “As public funding is cut, the administration becomes more reliant on private donors. These donors then use that leverage, threatening to withdraw donations if an administration doesn’t act.” The problem is worsening as public funds for higher education are drying up across the country, according to a recent report by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. As this money dwindles, administrations turn to wealthy donors, creating the conditions under which prestigious donors can sway administrator’s decisions on how to respond to controversial faculty, if those faculty can get hired in the first place.

#### Endowment funds are key to innovation

Leigh 14 [Steven R. Leigh (dean of CU-Boulder’s College of Arts and Sciences), "Endowments and the future of higher education," UColorado Boulder, March 2014] AZ

These broad trends point directly to the need for CU-Boulder’s College of Arts and Sciences to increase endowment funding across the college. Endowments drive improvements in the quality of an institution and reflect alums, donors and supporters who recognize the importance of research universities in the 21st century. Endowed professorships are the first and most important component of increasing our academic quality. Named chairs recognize significant faculty achievements and help the university support faculty salary and research. CU-Boulder professors are among the most productive in the nation and are heavily recruited by competitors, including Harvard, Yale, Stanford, Cornell, Berkeley, Illinois, UC Irvine and many others. Often, these competitors offer our faculty endowed professorships, conferring prestige and research support. CU must provide its faculty with comparable support to be competitive. A second major area for endowments is student scholarships and, for graduate students, fellowships. A stable source of income that helps pay tuition is the most direct and effective way to offset the costs of education. Endowed scholarships are also effective recruiting tools for admitting the nation’s best to CU. Our dynamic programs, departments and majors are attracting more and more applicants, including the best in the nation. Like faculty support, endowed scholarships and fellowships confer prestige and, most importantly, allow students to focus entirely on academics without balancing jobs and worrying about future loan repayments. Finally, endowment funding for programs greatly enriches the institution, providing capabilities that are difficult to attain when tuition revenue provides the majority of funding. Institutions funded mainly by tuition must make sure that expenditures directly benefit students, which sometimes limits options for innovation and risk-taking. Programmatic funding enables faculty and students to take risks in their research and creative work. For example, in my own field, this might involve traveling to an unexplored region to prospect for human fossils or archaeological sites. Support for high-risk projects allows our faculty and students to develop new areas of knowledge, benefitting society by broadening the capacity of the institution to innovate. The future of higher education, including CU’s future, depends to a large degree on how successfully we can build major endowments. Ultimately, U.S. competitiveness and leadership in the global knowledge economy depends on this as well. For alums, donors and supporters, endowments indelibly affirm the importance of higher education and enduringly preserve its viability and vitality.

#### Innovation solves great power war

Taylor 4 – Professor of Political Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (Mark, “The Politics of Technological Change: International Relations versus Domestic Institutions,” Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 4/1/2004, <http://www.scribd.com/doc/46554792/Taylor>) //RGP

I. Introduction Technological innovation is of central importance to the study of international relations (IR), affecting almost every aspect of the sub-field. First and foremost, a nation’s technological capability has a significant effect on its economic growth, industrial might, and military prowess; therefore relative national technological capabilities necessarily influence the balance of power between states, and hence have a role in calculations of war and alliance formation. Second, technology and innovative capacity also determine a nation’s trade profile, affecting which products it will import and export, as well as where multinational corporations will base their production facilities. Third, insofar as innovation-driven economic growth both attracts investment and produces surplus capital, a nation’s technological ability will also affect international financial flows and who has power over them. Thus, in broad theoretical terms, technological change is important to the study of IR because of its overall implications for both the relative and absolute power of states. And if theory alone does not convince, then history also tells us that nations on the technological ascent generally experience a corresponding and dramatic change in their global stature and influence, such as Britain during the first industrial revolution, the United States and Germany during the second industrial revolution, and Japan during the twentieth century. Conversely, great powers which fail to maintain their place at the technological frontier generally drift and fade from influence on international scene. This is not to suggest that technological innovation alone determines international politics, but rather that shifts in both relative and absolute technological capability have a major impact on international relations, and therefore need to be better understood by IR scholars. Indeed, the importance of technological innovation to international relations is seldom disputed by IR theorists. Technology is rarely the sole or overriding causal variable in any given IR theory, but a broad overview of the major theoretical debates reveals the ubiquity of technological causality. For example, from Waltz to Posen, almost all Realists have a place for technology in their explanations of international politics. At the very least, they describe it as an essential part of the distribution of material capabilities across nations, or an indirect source of military doctrine. And for some, like Gilpin quoted above, technology is the very cornerstone of great power domination, and its transfer the main vehicle by which war and change occur in world politics. Jervis tells us that the balance of offensive and defensive military technology affects the incentives for war. Walt agrees, arguing that technological change can alter a state’s aggregate power, and thereby affect both alliance formation and the international balance of threats. Liberals are less directly concerned with technological change, but they must admit that by raising or lowering the costs of using force, technological progress affects the rational attractiveness of international cooperation and regimes. Technology also lowers information & transactions costs and thus increases the applicability of international institutions, a cornerstone of Liberal IR theory. And in fostering flows of trade, finance, and information, technological change can lead to Keohane’s interdependence or Thomas Friedman et al’s globalization. Meanwhile, over at the “third debate”, Constructivists cover the causal spectrum on the issue, from Katzenstein’s “cultural norms” which shape security concerns and thereby affect technological innovation; to Wendt’s “stripped down technological determinism” in which technology inevitably drives nations to form a world state. However most Constructivists seem to favor Wendt, arguing that new technology changes people’s identities within society, and sometimes even creates new cross-national constituencies, thereby affecting international politics. Of course, Marxists tend to see technology as determining all social relations and the entire course of history, though they describe mankind’s major fault lines as running between economic classes rather than nation-states. Finally, Buzan & Little remind us that without advances in the technologies of transportation, communication, production, and war, international systems would not exist in the first place.

### Impact – Warming

#### Endowments are key to education quality

ACE 14 ["Understanding College and University Endowments," American Council on Education, 2014] AZ

An endowment is an aggregation of assets invested by a college or university to support its educational mission in perpetuity. An institution’s endowment actually comprises hundreds or thousands of individual endowments. An endowment allows donors to transfer their private dollars to public purposes with the assurance that their gifts will serve these purposes for as long as the institution continues to exist. An endowment represents a compact between a donor and an institution. It links past, current, and future generations. It also allows an institution to make commitments far into the future, knowing that resources to meet those commitments will continue to be available. Endowments serve institutions and the public by: • Providing stability. College and university revenues fluctuate over time with changes in enrollment (tuition), donor interest (gifts), and public (largely state and federal) support. Although endowment earnings also vary with changes in financial markets and investment strategies, most institutions follow prudent guidelines (spending rates) to buffer economic fluctuations that are intended to produce a relatively stable stream of income. Since endowment principal is not spent, the interest generated by endowment earnings supports institutional priorities year after year. This kind of stability is especially important for activities that cannot readily be started and stopped, or for which fluctuating levels of support could be costly or debilitating. Endowments frequently support student aid, faculty positions, innovative academic programs, medical research, and libraries. • Leveraging other sources of revenue. In recent years, as the economy has been severely stressed, institutions have dramatically increased their own student aid expenditures, and endowments have enabled institutions to respond more fully to changing demographics and families’ financial need. It is not surprising that the colleges and universities with the largest endowments are also the ones most likely to offer needblind admission (admitting students without regard to financial circumstances and then providing enough financial aid to enable those admitted to attend). An endowment also allows a college or university to provide a higher level of quality or service at a lower price than would otherwise be possible. This has been especially important in recent years, particularly for publicly supported institutions that have experienced significant cuts in state support. Without endowments or other private gifts, institutions would have had to cut back even further on their programs, levy even greater increases in their prices to students, and/or obtain additional public funding to maintain current programs at current prices. Encouraging innovation and flexibility. An endowment enables faculty and students to conduct innovative research, explore new academic fields, apply new technologies, and develop new teaching methods even if funding is not readily available from other sources, including tuition, gifts, or grants. Such innovation and flexibility has led to entirely new programs and to important discoveries in science, medicine, education, and other fields. • Allowing a longer time horizon. Unlike gifts expended upon receipt, an endowed gift keeps giving over time. Endowed institutions can plan strategically to use a more reliable stream of earnings to strengthen and enhance the quality of their programs, even if many years will be required to achieve some of their goals. By making endowed gifts, alumni and others take responsibility for ensuring the long-term well-being of colleges and universities; their gifts help enable future generations of students to benefit from a higher quality of education and allow these institutions to make even greater contributions to the public good

#### High quality training and research at colleges is key to solve climate change

Snibbe 15 [Kris Snibbe, "Colleges have ‘special’ role in fighting climate change," Harvard Gazette, 3/17/2015] AZ

In an address to faculty and students at Tsinghua University today, Harvard President Drew Faust argued forcefully that universities have a unique and critical role to play in combating climate change. She opened her remarks by recalling her last visit to Tsinghua in 2008. “There is a proverb that the best time to plant a tree is 20 years ago — and the second-best time is now,” Faust told the audience of about 250 Chinese students, faculty, and journalists. “When I first visited Tsinghua seven years ago … I planted a tree with [former Tsinghua] President Gu [Binglin] in the Friendship Garden … I am glad the Tsinghua-Harvard tree stands as a symbol of the many relationships across our two universities, relationships which continue to grow and thrive,” she said. “More than ever, it is as a testament to the possibilities that, by working together, we offer the world. That is why I want to spend a few minutes today talking about the special role universities like ours play in addressing climate change.” Faust’s speech marked the culmination of a series of events in Beijing at which climate change was a central topic. At a gathering of alumni, faculty, and friends on Sunday, she looked on as Ali Malkawi, professor of architectural technology at the Harvard Graduate School of Design (GSD) and founding director of the Harvard Center for Green Buildings and Cities, explained his efforts to reduce the carbon footprint of large human-made structures and systems, from individual buildings to whole cities. On Monday, Faust and Chinese President Xi Jinping, meeting at the Great Hall of the People, discussed governmental and academic efforts to address the threat of climate change. Faust used the opportunity to highlight the important work being undertaken by faculty and students at Harvard and at institutions across the globe such as Tsinghua to develop substantive technological and policy solutions to this global challenge and to urge continued faculty collaborations. “Last November, President Xi and President Obama made a joint announcement on climate change, pledging to limit the greenhouse gas emissions of China and the United States over the next several decades,” Faust said. “It is a landmark accord, setting ambitious goals for the world’s two largest carbon-emitting countries and establishing a marker that presidents Xi and Obama hope will inspire other countries to do the same. “We could not have predicted such a shared commitment seven [years] or even one year ago between these two leaders — both, in fact, our alumni — one a Tsinghua graduate in chemical engineering and the humanities and the other a graduate of Harvard Law School,” she continued. “And yet our two institutions had already sown the seeds of this agreement decades ago by educating leaders who can turn months of discussion into an international milestone, and by collaborating for more than 20 years on the climate analyses that made the agreement possible. In other words, by doing the things universities are uniquely designed to do.” Calling the recent agreement a “defining moment … worthy of celebration,” and giving China credit for building the world’s largest wind-power capacity as well as the second-largest capacity in solar energy, Faust nonetheless said that these efforts represent “only a beginning” of what needs to be done. “Industry, education, agriculture, business, finance, individual citizens — all are necessary participants in what must become an energy and environmental revolution, a new paradigm that will improve public health, care for the planet, and put both of our nations on the path toward a prosperous, low-carbon economy,” she argued. “Universities are especially good at ‘thinking different,’ ” Faust said in her prepared text, quoting an expression often used by Apple founder Steve Jobs. “To every generation falls a daunting task. This is our task: to ‘think different’ about how we inhabit the Earth. Where better to meet this challenge than in Boston and Beijing? How better to meet it than by unlocking and harnessing new knowledge, building political and cultural understanding, promoting dialogue, and sharing solutions? Who better to meet it than you, the most extraordinary students — imaginative, curious, daring. The challenge we face demands three great necessities.” Faust made the case that the three great necessities of creating partnerships, undertaking research, and training students to ask and answer the big questions ultimately will yield substantive solutions to this global challenge.

#### Warming is real, anthropogenic, and causes extinction – default to risk management – costs are inevitable, it’s only a question of magnitude – reducing emissions now is key

Nuccitelli 14 [Dana, MS in Physics from UC Davis and Environmental Scientist at a Private Environmental Consulting Firm in California, March 30, “IPCC Report Warns Of Future Climate Change Risks, But Is Spun By Contrarians,” http://www.theguardian.com/environment/climate-consensus-97-per-cent/2014/mar/31/ipcc-warns-climate-change-risks]

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has just published its latest Working Group II report detailing impacts, adaptation, and vulnerability associated with climate change. The picture it paints with respect to the consequences of continued climate change is rather bleak. For example, the report discusses the risk associated with food insecurity due to more intense droughts, floods, and heat waves in a warmer world, especially for poorer countries. This contradicts the claims of climate contrarians like Matt Ridley, who have tried to claim that rising carbon dioxide levels are good for crops. While rising carbon dioxide levels have led to 'global greening' in past decades and improved agricultural technology has increased crop yields, research has indicated that both of these trends are already beginning to reverse. While plants like carbon dioxide, they don't like heat waves, droughts, and floods. Likewise, economist Richard Tol has argued that farmers can adapt to climate change, but adaptation has its costs and its limits. In fact, the IPCC summary report notes that most studies project a decline in crop yields starting in 2030, even as global food demand continues to rise. The report also discusses risks associated with water insecurity, due for example to shrinking of glaciers that act as key water resources for various regions around the world, and through changing precipitation patterns. As a result of these types of changes, the IPCC also anticipates that violent conflicts like civil wars will become more common. The number of people exposed to river floods is projected to increase with the level of warming over the remainder of the century. Sea-level rise will also cause submergence, flooding, and erosion of coastal regions and low-lying areas. And ocean acidification poses significant risk for marine ecosystems; coral reefs in particular. The general risk of species extinctions rises as the planet warms. More climate change means that suitable climates for species shift. The faster these climate zones shift, the more species will be unable to track and adapt to those changes. "Many species will be unable to track suitable climates under mid- and high-range rates of climate change (i.e., RCP4.5, 6.0, and 8.5) during the 21st century (medium confidence). Lower rates of change (i.e., RCP2.6) will pose fewer problems." The report also estimates that global surface warming of approximately 2°C above current temperatures may lead to global income losses of 0.2 to 2.0 percent. However, "Losses are more likely than not to be greater, rather than smaller, than this range ... few quantitative estimates have been completed for additional warming around 3°C or above." Even in the IPCC's most aggressive greenhouse gas emissions reductions scenario, we only limit global warming to around 1°C above current temperatures. In a business-as-usual scenario, temperatures warm about another 4°C – yet we have difficultly estimating the costs of warming exceeding another 2°C. In other words, failing to curb human-caused global warming poses major risks to the global economy. Nevertheless, there will be a certain amount of climate change that we won't be able to avoid, and the IPCC report notes that adaptation to those changes is also critically important. However, we first need to accept the scientific reality of human-caused climate change in order to plan for what's to come. As a notable counter-example, the state of North Carolina recently introduced a bill that would require state coastal planning to ignore all new scientific research with regards to sea-level rise. Obviously we can't adapt to threats if we deny their existence. However, the IPCC report notes that many governments are already beginning to take steps to adapt to climate change impacts in their regions. The good news is that the IPCC reports that many of these climate risks can be reduced by cutting greenhouse gas emissions and thus avoiding the worst climate change scenarios. The IPCC states with high confidence that risks associated with reduced agricultural yields, water scarcity, inundation of coastal infrastructure from sea-level rise, and adverse impacts from heat waves, floods, and droughts can be reduced by cutting human greenhouse gas emissions. In the end it all boils down to risk management. The stronger our efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, the lower the risk of extreme climate impacts. The higher our emissions, the larger climate changes we'll face, which also means more expensive adaptation, more species extinctions, more food and water insecurities, more income losses, more conflicts, and so forth. Contrarians have tried to spin the conclusions of the report to incorrectly argue that it would be cheaper to try and adapt to climate change and pay the costs of climate damages. In reality the report says no such thing. The IPCC simply tells us that even if we manage to prevent the highest risk scenarios, climate change costs will still be high, and we can't even grasp how high climate damage costs will be in the highest risk scenarios. As Chris Field, Co-Chair of Working Group II noted, "With high levels of warming that result from continued growth in greenhouse gas emissions, risks will be challenging to manage, and even serious, sustained investments in adaptation will face limits" We're committed to a certain amount of climate change, and as glaciologist Lonnie Thompson famously put it, "The only question is how much we will mitigate, adapt, and suffer". The latest IPCC report confirms that minimizing adaptation and suffering through risk management by reducing human greenhouse gas emissions is a no-brainer.

### Module – UC system

#### The UC system is a hotspot for national research, innovation, and business-startups

Bay Area Economic Institute 16 ["Entrepreneurs, Startups, and Innovation at the University of California," August 2016] AZ

While there are many variants, UC initiatives to support entrepreneur-led startups largely fall into four categories: business plan competitions, entrepreneurial education and support, incubators and accelerators (which provide cost-effective lab or office space), and funding. These blocks of activity are not mutually exclusive and frequently overlap. For example, programs with large entrepreneurial education components can also sponsor business plan competitions or host accelerators. Some campuses also help to accelerate research at highly affordable rates by offering access to sophisticated research facilities and equipment (“user facilities”) that would be too expensive for startups to own independently. UC’s campuses also connect to what can be termed “associated programs and facilities.” These incubators, accelerators or other programs are located off-campus and are not directly administered by UC but are symbiotically linked and exist in large part to leverage their proximity to a UC campus. This is one important way that the campuses serve as focal points of local and regional innovation ecosystems. Every UC campus has programs or initiatives in one or all of the four major categories, as well as associated programs in the vicinity. Not surprisingly, the largest programs tend to be on campuses in major urban centers, where they benefit in some degree from their proximity to large business communities that serve as sources of mentors, investors, and customers. Campuses that are smaller, younger and not in major urban centers in most cases have less developed programs. However, some campuses such as Davis and Irvine that are not in large urban centers have successfully leveraged their resources and partnerships in the community to create dynamic and sophisticated programs. Not all UC-associated startups have participated in formal support programs. While a few entrepreneurial initiatives date back to the 1980s, most—even on the large campuses—are more recent, having been launched within the last four years. For this reason, more time will be required to evaluate their success. All campuses, however, are increasing their focus on entrepreneurial support and are increasing their ties to surrounding communities through collaborative initiatives to enable locally-based startups.

#### UC endowments are key to solving climate change – funding, research, and tech development

UC Office of the President 15 ["UC only university to join coalition led by Bill Gates to invest in climate solutions," UC Press Room, 11/29/2015] AZ

The University of California announced today (Nov. 29) that it has joined the Breakthrough Energy Coalition, an influential group of investors led by Bill Gates that is committed to investing in technology that can help solve the urgent energy and climate challenges facing the planet. UC and its Office of the Chief Investment Officer, which manages the university’s endowment and pension funds, is the sole institutional investor among the 28 coalition members from 10 countries. The coalition is a counterpart to Mission Innovation, an initiative of 19 countries committed to dramatically increasing research and development funding for early-stage clean energy innovation over the next five years. Both initiatives were announced today at the COP21 in Paris, the United Nations Climate Change Conference. “The University of California, with its 10 campuses and three national energy labs, is home to some of the best climate scientists in the world and as a public research institution we take the imperative to solve global climate change very seriously,” said UC President Janet Napolitano. “With access to the private capital represented by investors in the Breakthrough Energy Coalition we can more effectively integrate our public research pipeline to deliver new technology and insights that will revolutionize the way the world thinks about and uses energy.” “We can’t ask for a better partner than the University of California Office of the President and the Office of the Chief Investment Officer to help accomplish the Breakthrough Energy Coalition’s ambitious goal,” Gates said. “The UC system – with its world leading campuses and labs – produces the kinds of groundbreaking technologies that will help define a global energy future that is cheaper, more reliable and does not contribute to climate change.” Said Jagdeep Singh Bachher, UC’s chief investment officer: “Investing in our new energy future alongside visionaries like Bill Gates and the other influential investors and philanthropists represents a historic opportunity for the University of California, the state of California and the world.” In addition to committing to the coalition’s statement of investment principles, UC and its Office of the Chief Investment Officer will: Serve in a leadership role with other endowments and pension funds to explore how they can productively participate in these early-stage investments Invest alongside other members of the coalition in vehicles created to facilitate the statement of principles, which includes the imperatives to invest early, broadly, boldly, wisely and together Work with the coalition and the investment vehicles it creates to share information and source deals that emerge from UC’s 10 campuses and three national energy labs Collaborate with public institutions in other Mission Innovation countries to share approaches to developing research for private sector investment. In November 2013, Napolitano announced UC’s Carbon Neutrality Initiative, which commits the university to becoming carbon neutral by 2025, which would make UC the first major university in the United States to reach this achievement. The ambitious target builds on UC’s pioneering work on climate research – as evidenced by its report on 10 scalable solutions announced last month – and furthers its leadership on sustainable business practices. UC is improving its energy efficiency, developing new sources of renewable energy and enacting a range of related strategies to cut carbon emissions. UC’s Office of the Chief Investment Officer has committed $1 billion of its investment capital for early-stage and scale-up investments in clean energy innovation over the next five years, as well as an additional $250 million to fund innovative, early-stage ideas emerging from the UC ecosystem. It also has created an aligned intermediary, which will help large-scale, long-term investors channel significant amounts of institutional capital into resource innovation investments – including energy, waste and water – across the planet. The University of California, home to 61 Nobel laureates, 86 winners of the MacArthur Foundation’s “genius” grants and 67 recipients of the Medal of Science, is widely considered to be the world’s premier public research university system.

#### Warming is real, anthropogenic, and causes extinction – default to risk management – costs are inevitable, it’s only a question of magnitude – reducing emissions now is key

Nuccitelli 14 [Dana, MS in Physics from UC Davis and Environmental Scientist at a Private Environmental Consulting Firm in California, March 30, “IPCC Report Warns Of Future Climate Change Risks, But Is Spun By Contrarians,” http://www.theguardian.com/environment/climate-consensus-97-per-cent/2014/mar/31/ipcc-warns-climate-change-risks]

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has just published its latest Working Group II report detailing impacts, adaptation, and vulnerability associated with climate change. The picture it paints with respect to the consequences of continued climate change is rather bleak. For example, the report discusses the risk associated with food insecurity due to more intense droughts, floods, and heat waves in a warmer world, especially for poorer countries. This contradicts the claims of climate contrarians like Matt Ridley, who have tried to claim that rising carbon dioxide levels are good for crops. While rising carbon dioxide levels have led to 'global greening' in past decades and improved agricultural technology has increased crop yields, research has indicated that both of these trends are already beginning to reverse. While plants like carbon dioxide, they don't like heat waves, droughts, and floods. Likewise, economist Richard Tol has argued that farmers can adapt to climate change, but adaptation has its costs and its limits. In fact, the IPCC summary report notes that most studies project a decline in crop yields starting in 2030, even as global food demand continues to rise. The report also discusses risks associated with water insecurity, due for example to shrinking of glaciers that act as key water resources for various regions around the world, and through changing precipitation patterns. As a result of these types of changes, the IPCC also anticipates that violent conflicts like civil wars will become more common. The number of people exposed to river floods is projected to increase with the level of warming over the remainder of the century. Sea-level rise will also cause submergence, flooding, and erosion of coastal regions and low-lying areas. And ocean acidification poses significant risk for marine ecosystems; coral reefs in particular. The general risk of species extinctions rises as the planet warms. More climate change means that suitable climates for species shift. The faster these climate zones shift, the more species will be unable to track and adapt to those changes. "Many species will be unable to track suitable climates under mid- and high-range rates of climate change (i.e., RCP4.5, 6.0, and 8.5) during the 21st century (medium confidence). Lower rates of change (i.e., RCP2.6) will pose fewer problems." The report also estimates that global surface warming of approximately 2°C above current temperatures may lead to global income losses of 0.2 to 2.0 percent. However, "Losses are more likely than not to be greater, rather than smaller, than this range ... few quantitative estimates have been completed for additional warming around 3°C or above." Even in the IPCC's most aggressive greenhouse gas emissions reductions scenario, we only limit global warming to around 1°C above current temperatures. In a business-as-usual scenario, temperatures warm about another 4°C – yet we have difficultly estimating the costs of warming exceeding another 2°C. In other words, failing to curb human-caused global warming poses major risks to the global economy. Nevertheless, there will be a certain amount of climate change that we won't be able to avoid, and the IPCC report notes that adaptation to those changes is also critically important. However, we first need to accept the scientific reality of human-caused climate change in order to plan for what's to come. As a notable counter-example, the state of North Carolina recently introduced a bill that would require state coastal planning to ignore all new scientific research with regards to sea-level rise. Obviously we can't adapt to threats if we deny their existence. However, the IPCC report notes that many governments are already beginning to take steps to adapt to climate change impacts in their regions. The good news is that the IPCC reports that many of these climate risks can be reduced by cutting greenhouse gas emissions and thus avoiding the worst climate change scenarios. The IPCC states with high confidence that risks associated with reduced agricultural yields, water scarcity, inundation of coastal infrastructure from sea-level rise, and adverse impacts from heat waves, floods, and droughts can be reduced by cutting human greenhouse gas emissions. In the end it all boils down to risk management. The stronger our efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, the lower the risk of extreme climate impacts. The higher our emissions, the larger climate changes we'll face, which also means more expensive adaptation, more species extinctions, more food and water insecurities, more income losses, more conflicts, and so forth. Contrarians have tried to spin the conclusions of the report to incorrectly argue that it would be cheaper to try and adapt to climate change and pay the costs of climate damages. In reality the report says no such thing. The IPCC simply tells us that even if we manage to prevent the highest risk scenarios, climate change costs will still be high, and we can't even grasp how high climate damage costs will be in the highest risk scenarios. As Chris Field, Co-Chair of Working Group II noted, "With high levels of warming that result from continued growth in greenhouse gas emissions, risks will be challenging to manage, and even serious, sustained investments in adaptation will face limits" We're committed to a certain amount of climate change, and as glaciologist Lonnie Thompson famously put it, "The only question is how much we will mitigate, adapt, and suffer". The latest IPCC report confirms that minimizing adaptation and suffering through risk management by reducing human greenhouse gas emissions is a no-brainer.

## 2NR Materials

### A2 Private Donors Not Key

#### Private donors key to fund public colleges – cuts in state budget

Applegate 12 [Jamie Applegate (reporter), "Survey shows increased reliance on private donations to fund public universities," Daily Californian, 2/21/2012] AZ

A survey released Wednesday shows an increase in private donations toward public universities, indicating a shift toward a funding model that seeks to fill the gaps left by large cuts to state funding with an increased reliance on philanthropy. The Voluntary Support of Education survey conducted by the Council for Aid to Education found that charitable contributions to colleges and universities across the country increased 8.2 percent in 2011, reaching a total of $30.3 billion in donations. UC Berkeley — which ranked in the top 20 earners along with UCLA and UC San Francisco — has increased its efforts toward raising private funds through a campaign emulating those of private universities. David Blinder, UC Berkeley’s associate vice chancellor for university relations, said that with state funding having dropped to a total of $220 million this year, funding from private donors has become an important part of the way the campus funds itself. UC Berkeley ranked 18th in the survey, with a total of $283.35 million in donations in 2011. “Tuition is now a major source of revenue in a way that historically it wasn’t for public colleges, as well as philanthropy,” Blinder said. “Philanthropy was always key in the private university world. That was their life blood, whereas we had traditionally relied on public support. We did need to learn from the privates.” In 2005, the Campaign for Berkeley was created with the goal of raising $3 billion by 2013, in order to channel funds toward undergraduate scholarships, faculty chairs and research, among other endeavors. Campaign spokesperson Jose Rodriguez said $2.34 billion had been raised as of Dec. 31, 2011. A similar five-year fundraising campaign at Stanford University — The Stanford Challenge — raised $6.2 billion upon its conclusion in February, enough to build or renovate 38 buildings, provide funding for 139 new endowed faculty positions and create 366 new graduate fellowships. Stanford ranked first in the survey’s list of top fundraising universities, with a total of $709.42 million in donations received in 2011. Despite the increasing importance of private funding, UCLA spokesperson Phil Hampton said it should not be seen as a major solution for tight budgets. UCLA ranked eighth in the survey as the top fundraising public university, garnering $415.03 million in support in 2011. “It’s important to know that private giving cannot be seen as a replacement of state funding,” Hampton said. “Most gifts come with restrictions and are intended for specific uses — uses that aren’t funded by direct state support.” Private support for university needs that are not funded directly by the state — such as endowments and capital projects — increased 13.6 percent in 2011 and “follows declining or stagnant levels of giving in recent years,” the survey states. Private fundraising might be more difficult for public universities to engage in because of a lack of alumni awareness of a need for such funding, according to John Douglass, a senior research fellow at the Center for Studies in Higher Education at UC Berkeley. “The fact is it will be very difficult for nothing but the name-brand, elite public universities to generate large donations to help subsidize the operating costs of the vast majority of public college and universities,” Douglass said in an email. “The alumni of public institutions on average come from less affluent parts of society and have less to give.” However, Blinder said that much of the success of UC Berkeley’s fundraising campaign has been motivated by an increasing awareness on the part of donors that public universities need more financial support to replace lost state funding. “For a while, it was difficult to get that message across,” Blinder said. “We are a state university, and we’re committed to the mission, but at this point, the figure is that just over 10 percent of our budget is coming from the state.”

### A2 Trump Link turn

#### It's just talk – there's no jurisdiction for Trump to withdraw funding

Toppo 2/2 [Greg Toppo, "Can Trump pull funding from UC Berkeley? Not likely, experts say," USA Today, 2/2/2017] AZ

But experts say Trump's threat is an empty one, even in the face of Wednesday’s violence. “There is currently no federal law that would allow the federal government to deny funding to an institution of higher education because they prohibited someone from speaking on campus,” said Terry Hartle, senior vice president of the Washington, D.C-based American Council on Education (ACE), which represents college presidents. The government can withdraw federal funding, he said, but it's typically because of fraud or research misconduct. Even then, Hartle added, most research dollars are awarded — and withdrawn — through peer review. “So the ability of a president to sort of retaliate against a particular institution is pretty limited.” The question arises from time to time, he said — during the Vietnam War, House lawmakers considered denying federal aid to students who participated in campus protests. But Hartle said there’s “no authority to do that under current law — and I think developing a way to do that could be very problematic.”

### A2 Donors Restrictive Programs

#### Irrelevant – those programs are good

### A2 Alumni Dislike Censorship [Willinger]

#### Goes neg – here's a line

university administrations have been too meek in addressing protesters whose messages have seemed to fly in the face of free speech.

#### Donors think that colleges aren't hardline enough – that proves that removing all restrictions on speech would piss them off even further

#### This argument conflates student protests that advocate for censorship with censorship itself – Willinger says that donors dislike protests that call for censorship, but not censorship itself.

#### The card is summarizing Hartocollis, which is a neg card – alumni halt donations when they perceive protests as far too wrapped up in identity politics, which is precisely our link

#### Our link outweighs – donors withdraw funding due to controversial speech such as anti-Israel criticism or hate speech – outweighs a risk of the link turn

#### Strength of link – the neg doesn't contest our link, while we deny their Willinger argument, so our link is more probable on face

#### Specificity – our card is in the context of public colleges like UCSB – Willinger references Amherst and other private schools

### A2 Alumni-Student Discussion

#### This argument makes no sense – the gap between alumni and students is not created by free speech restrictions, but rather by a failure of administrations to create direct conversations – here's a line from the card

PEN America’s own experience of reaching out to students, engaging in direct dialogue, and hearing their points of view has helped us better understand positions and demands that may have come across from a distance as self-indulgent or misguided

#### No impact – student protests will continue regardless of friendly conversations – merely talking to alumni donors won't change their minds when they witness anti-Israel rallies on campus

#### Simply doesn't apply – PEN America is a private organization created to promote communication and has nothing to do with campus policy on free speech

### A2 Endowments Fail [Rotherham]

#### False – endowments go toward attracting students, funding professorships, and recruiting new research – that's Leigh 14

#### Reject their evidence – it identifies an "anonymous" source but doesn't detail the specificities of that college or which college that is – journalists have an incentive to exaggerate stories to grab attention through big headlines

### A2 Not Cash [Rotherham]

#### Empirics and analysis of all colleges in the US prove – alt assets constitute small part of endowments

Rosen & Sappington 15 [Harvey S. Rosen (Princeton University), Alexander J.W. Sappington (Sappington & Associates), "What Do University Endowment Managers Worry About? An Analysis of Alternative Asset Investments and Background Income," Griswold Center for Economic Policy Studies, June 2015] AZ

The table indicates that alternative assets comprise about 17 percent of university endowments in our analysis sample.14 This figure is the mean over all institutions; if we take the mean conditional on having a positive amount invested in alternative assets, the share is 20 percent. In 1987, the beginning of our sample period, the unconditional mean share of alternative assets was 5 percent, and only 62 percent of the endowments held any alternative assets. By the end of our sample period, the unconditional proportion was 30 percent, and 90 percent of the institutions held alternative assets.

#### Alternative assets and illiquidity are good – it promotes long-term sustainability of a college's endowment, which ensures spending on research even during times of financial crisis – outweighs

#### Crises are inevitable – history proves a boom-and-bust cycle

#### Strong spending by colleges during crisis are especially key during economic crisis – it promotes education and innovation to break out of stagnation

#### Permanent endowments are key – they promote research in the long term

APLU 16 ["Public University Endowments: An Essential Tool to Advance

Education, Research, and Engagement," Association of Public & Land Grant Universities, 9/12/2016] AZ

College and university endowment funds are an important source of revenue to support our institutions’ teaching, research, and public service missions. Endowments are complex and vary by institution. They usually consist of many – sometimes thousands – of distinct funds. Most of these funds are subject to restrictions that donors stipulate and that institutions must legally uphold. Endowment funds are managed to provide a permanent source of income to help support the teaching, research, and engagement programs of institutions. The interest/earnings on the base gifts provide revenue to help advance the universities’ missions. Since endowments are a permanent source of funding, the funds must be managed for perpetuity to ensure the gifts provide support for current and future students, faculty and staff.

#### Colleges are liquidizing now [*don't read with alt assets good]*

Stripling 9 [Jack Stripling (a senior reporter for The Chronicle of Higher Education, where he covers college and university leadership), "Give Me Liquidity!" Insider Higher Education, 4/24/2009] AZ

If there’s any trend emerging, it’s that institutions with endowments of varied sizes are moving toward more liquid investments that allow for speedier access to cash. Met with significant demands on resources at a time when resources are dwindling, colleges simply need money now – like right now. The urgent need for cash on hand, or liquidity, has some finance chiefs looking to disentangle themselves from the complex, long-term investment vehicles that came into vogue across higher education in the last decade. “It is definitely back to the future in terms of investing,” Nelson said. “You’ll probably see small and medium endowments looking more like they did 10 years ago.” While college officials are often rather cautious about discussing specific investment strategies, several have tipped their hands slightly in recent months. The University of Chicago, Harvard University and Northeastern University have all indicated they’re going to become less reliant on potentially “illiquid” assets like private equity, a category that includes investments in start-up companies. These investments are complex because they involve assets that aren’t publicly traded, and colleges that aim to get into the private equity game need great knowledge and expertise to accurately value the assets. Moreover, the payoff in private equity typically takes years – a luxury many colleges can’t afford right now. Seeking quick access to funds, Northeastern University officials recently took a dramatic step. The university has liquidized up to 50 percent of its endowment, Faculty Senate minutes indicate. Northeastern officials declined to discuss how exactly the university is changing its asset mix, but a Moody’s report indicates the university now has 44 percent of its endowment in cash – the most liquid asset of all. By placing nearly half of its endowment in cash, Northeastern is likely moving out of some of its longer-term investments and placing funds into easily accessible arenas like money market accounts, CDs and short-term treasury bonds.

### A2 Alumni Donate More

#### Empirically disproven – claim without a card

#### Alumni can't guarantee that their donation will lead to particular changes, so they won't donate at all

#### Alumni don't often donate to make particular changes, but rather because they feel pride about their school

## Links

### Link – Generic

#### Benefactors blame colleges for allowing unregulated speech

MacDonald 05

G. Jeffrey MacDonald Correspondent of The Christian Science Monitor. Donors: too much say on campus speech? ; Colleges feel more pressure from givers who want to help determine who'll be speaking on campus. The Christian Science Monitor [Boston, Mass] 10 Feb 2005: 11. [Premier]

According to Hamilton President Joan Hinde Stewart, **angry benefactors threatened to quit giving if the** Clinton, N.Y., **college were to give a podium to the University of Colorado professor who had likened World Trade Center workers to Nazis in a 2001 essay**. In doing so, **they employed an increasingly popular tactic used at colleges in Utah, Nevada and Virginia** with mixed degrees of success last fall in attempts to derail scheduled appearances by "Fahrenheit 9-11" filmmaker Michael Moore. Although demanding givers are nothing new, **observers of higher education see** in recent events signs of **mounting clout for private interests to determine which ideas get a prominent platform on campus and which ones don't.** Faced with such pressures, administrators say they're trying to resist manipulation. Mr. Hamilton canceled Mr. Churchill's speech, Stewart said, only after a series of death threats pushed the situation "beyond our capacity to ensure the safety of our students and visitors." Yet **in an age when financiers increasingly want to set the terms for how their gifts are to be used, those responsible for the presentation of ideas and speakers seem to be approaching them much like other commodities on campus**. "**People** are **want**ing **their values portrayed and want**ing **institutions to do exactly what they want them to do**," said Dr. Wes Willmer, vice president of university advancement at Biola University in La Miranda, Calif., and a frequent writer on the topic of university fundraising. "They're not giving for the common good. They're giving because they want to accomplish something, and that plays out in the speaker realm as well." Pressure to reshape the landscape of ideas is coming from various corners. At the University of Nevada, Reno, **seven-figure donor Rick Reviglio threatened this fall to stop giving altogether unless the university, which had invited Mr. Moore, would instead arrange for the filmmaker to debate a prominent conservative. The university declined his $100,000 offer** to stage the event. In California and Virginia, state lawmakers helped persuade presidents at California State University San Marcos and George Mason University, respectively, that upwards of $30,000 for Moore's appearance would constitute an "inappropriate" use of state funds on the eve of an election. The San Marcos campus hosted the event anyway, however, after a student group raised its own money to sponsor it. In the case of Mr. Churchill, the controversy rages on. Since Hamilton's decision, administrators have nixed Mr. Churchill's scheduled appearances at Wheaton College (Mass.), Eastern Washington University and even his own institution, the University of Colorado at Boulder. Security concerns were officially to blame in each case, although activists who opposed Churchill's message have offered another explanation. "**Everything comes back down to money,** and they were worried about funding at Hamilton College," says Bill Doyle, outreach director for the World Trade Center United Families Group. He said survivors who lost loved ones in the 9/11 attacks had lobbied Hamilton's four largest corporate donors to withhold future gifts if Churchill were allowed to speak. "**You have all these rich corporations throughout the world and the country. Perhaps they'll take a look at what they're funding,**" says Doyle, **especially** in terms of **paid speakers who "promote hate.**"

#### Colleges face pressures to maintain their brand, so they have to be PC

Sleeper 16

Jim Sleeper, polisci prof @ Yale and Alternet reporter, “What the Campus 'Free Speech' Crusade Won't Say” <http://www.alternet.org/education/what-campus-free-speech-crusade-wont-say-0> [Premier]

When the FIRE and the larger conservative “free speech” campaign assail university administrators for curbing individual rights, they often wind up exposing but then fudging an inexorable reality: **The more market-driven a college, the more anxious it is to restrict free speech, because most deans and trustees serve not politically correct pieties but market pressures to satisfy student “customers” and to avoid negative publicity, liability, and losses in “brand” or “market share.” The real enemy of open inquiry and expression is the over-financialized, corrupt investment that the FIRE and its funders never question and, indeed, are out to defend.**

### Link – Regulation

#### Administrators need the ability to regulate speech to maintain donations

Press and Student Nation ‘16 [ALEX PRESS is a PhD student in sociology based in Boston. STUDENTNATION First-person accounts from student activists, organizers and journalists reporting on youth-oriented movements for social justice, economic equality and tolerance. “Silence on Campus: Contingent Work and Free Speech.” The Nation. February 17, 2016. https://www.thenation.com/article/silence-on-campus-contingent-work-and-free-speech/ JJN]

﻿Corporatization creates a dilemma for higher education: College, unlike most businesses, serves a social function—the production and transfer of knowledge—the achievement of which requires an environment of intellectual freedom that can conflict with profit margins, as some actors central to the model, such as donors, may take issue with controversial speech. In the past, tenure resolved some of this tension—once professors gain tenure, they’re walled off from these pressures, at least theoretically. With the erosion of tenure and a slack academic job market, free speech disappears as professors become increasingly disposable. As Steven Vallas, a sociologist at Northeastern University who researches the changing nature of work, argues, a professor’s right to speak freely presumes a foundation of job stability. “If you have an expansion of the adjunct, precarious professoriate, than you really are eroding the proportion of people who can speak their mind.” In contrast to claims that censorious students are the central threat to the ability of college to serve as a marketplace of ideas, the silencing of speech that comes with a sense of one’s disposability appears much more powerful. Conceding the difficulty of capturing the preemptive stifling of debate that comes with disposable worker status, we can take the severity of repercussions visited upon those who don’t censor themselves as indicative of the problem. Take the case of Steven Salaita, an indigenous studies scholar whose offer of a position at the University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign was rescinded after he tweeted critically about Israel’s 2014 attack on Gaza. A violation of academic freedom that resulted in a rare formal censure from the AAUP, for Salaita, administrative censorship is no secret. “For the uninitiated, the levels of vitriol and retribution that attend criticism of Israel can be stunning,” he writes, referencing a report authored by the Center for Constitutional Rights and Palestine Legal that details hundreds of reported acts of suppression of pro-Palestine advocacy in under two years. Salaita sued the University of Illinois for violating his rights. While he settled out of court for $875,000, discovery findings from his lawsuit reveal the likelihood of donor influence on the decision to fire him, with the chancellor communicating with donors about Salaita’s tweets and his possible dismissal. As Salaita’s case demonstrates, the extent of donor pressure goes a long way to explain why administrations might choose to silence speech, explains William Robinson, a professor at the University of California–Santa Barbara. In 2009, Robinson caught the attention of outside organizations that then pressured UCSB administrators to charge him with violating the university’s academic code of conduct, according to Robinson’s account of the incident, as well as details published by his supporters. Explaining the role financial needs play in decisions to censor faculty in public higher education, Robinson argues, “As public funding is cut, the administration becomes more reliant on private donors. These donors then use that leverage, threatening to withdraw donations if an administration doesn’t act.” The problem is worsening as public funds for higher education are drying up across the country, according to a recent report by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. As this money dwindles, administrations turn to wealthy donors, creating the conditions under which prestigious donors can sway administrator’s decisions on how to respond to controversial faculty, if those faculty can get hired in the first place.

### Link – Protest

#### Protests alienate alumni donors

Hartocollis 8/4 – Anemona Hartocollis, writer for NYT: August 4, 2016(“College Students Protest, Alumni’s Fondness Fades and Checks Shrink” New York Times Available at <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/05/us/college-protests-alumni-donations.html?_r=0> Accessed on 12/15/16)IG

Scott MacConnell cherishes the memory of his years at Amherst College, where he discovered his future métier as a theatrical designer. But protests on campus over cultural and racial sensitivities last year soured his feelings.

Now Mr. MacConnell, who graduated in 1960, is expressing his discontent through his wallet. In June, he cut the college out of his will.

“As an alumnus of the college, I feel that I have been lied to, patronized and basically dismissed as an old, white bigot who is insensitive to the needs and feelings of the current college community,” Mr. MacConnell, 77, wrote in a letter to the college’s alumni fund in December, when he first warned that he was reducing his support to the college to a token $5.

A backlash from alumni is an unexpected aftershock of the campus disruptions of the last academic year. Although fund-raisers are still gauging the extent of the effect on philanthropy, some colleges — particularly small, elite liberal arts institutions — have reported a decline in donations, accompanied by a laundry list of g5.

Alumni from a range of generations say they are baffled by today’s college culture. Among their laments: Students are too wrapped up in racial and identity politics. They are allowed to take too many frivolous courses. They have repudiated the heroes and traditions of the past by judging them by today’s standards rather than in the context of their times. Fraternities are being unfairly maligned, and men are being demonized by sexual assault investigations. And university administrations have been too meek in addressing protesters whose messages have seemed to fly in the face of free speech.

Scott C. Johnston, who graduated from Yale in 1982, said he was on campus last fall when activists tried to shut down a free speech conference, “because apparently they missed irony class that day.” He recalled the Yale student who was videotaped screaming at a professor, Nicholas Christakis, that he had failed “to create a place of comfort and home” for students in his capacity as the head of a residential college.

A rally at New Haven Superior Court demanding justice for Corey Menafee, an African-American dining hall worker at Yale’s Calhoun College who was charged with breaking a window pane that depicted black slaves carrying cotton. Credit Peter Hvizdak/New Haven Register, via Associated Press

“I don’t think anything has damaged Yale’s brand quite like that,” said Mr. Johnston, a founder of an internet start-up and a former hedge fund manager. “This is not your daddy’s liberalism.”

“The worst part,” he continued, “is that campus administrators are wilting before the activists like flowers.” Yale College’s alumni fund was flat between this year and last, according to Karen Peart, a university spokeswoman.

Among about 35 small, selective liberal arts colleges belonging to the fund-raising organization Staff, or Sharing the Annual Fund Fundamentals, that recently reported their initial annual fund results for the 2016 fiscal year, 29 percent were behind 2015 in dollars, and 64 percent were behind in donors, according to a steering committee member, Scott Kleinheksel of Claremont McKenna College in California. His school, which was also the site of protests, had a decline in donor participation but a rise in giving.

At Amherst, the amount of money given by alumni dropped 6.5 percent for the fiscal year that ended June 30, and participation in the alumni fund dropped 1.9 percentage points, to 50.6 percent, the lowest participation rate since 1975, when the college began admitting women, according to the college. The amount raised from big donors decreased significantly. Some of the decline was because of a falloff after two large reunion gifts last year, according to Pete Mackey, a spokesman for Amherst.

At Princeton, where protesters unsuccessfully demanded the removal of Woodrow Wilson’s name from university buildings and programs, undergraduate alumni donations dropped 6.6 percent from a record high the year before, and participation dropped 1.9 percentage points, according to the university’s website. A Princeton spokesman, John Cramer, said there was no evidence the drop was connected to campus protests.

#### Protest lead to reduced donations, enrollments, and financial support by the government

Keller 2/21 – Rudi Keller writer for the Columbia tribune: 2/21/16(“University of Missouri fundraising takes $6 million hit in December as donors hold back funds” Available at <http://www.columbiatribune.com/news/education/turmoil_at_mu/university-of-missouri-fundraising-takes-million-hit-in-december-as/article_ed7cfd5b-3b3e-5b18-95d9> f2945ac51172.html Accessed on 12/15/16)IF

New pledges and donations to the University of Missouri fell $6 million in December as the campus weathered the fallout of public discontent that also threatens to erode the school’s finances via state support and tuition revenue. December combines Christmas generosity and the promise of tax deductions on returns due April 15, making it a prime time for fundraisers at major institutions.

In December 2014, new pledges and donations for all campus activities including athletics totaled $19.6 million, according to figures compiled by the university’s advancement office. Only $13.6 million came in this December, a drop of about 31 percent. The figures represent new commitments and donations that are not given in fulfillment of previous pledges, Vice Chancellor of University Advancement Tom Hiles said.

For the three complete months since campus protests made international news in November, new pledges and donations to MU declined by about $7.4 million. Along with the decrease in new support, pledges totaling about $2 million were withdrawn, Hiles said. About 10 were gifts of $25,000 or more, including one for $500,000, he said.

Total new pledges and donations in fiscal year 2015 totaled $147.6 million, down from a record $164.1 million in fiscal year 2014.

The advancement office has fielded more than 2,000 calls from people upset with the university and tracks them by topic on a heat map.

“It ran the gamut from” Assistant Professor Melissa “Click to Planned Parenthood to just a general lack of leadership,” Hiles said. “‘Who’s in charge? Are the students running it?’ If I heard inmates are running the asylum one more time I was going to … . Those were the general categories.”

Student demonstrations over racism and marginalization on campus made international headlines after the Tiger football team announced it would boycott athletic activities in support of a hunger strike by Concerned Student 1950 member Jonathan Butler.

Athletic donations also have dipped, including a 68 percent drop in December cash gifts compared to December 2014 and a 38 percent decline in new pledges and donations as tallied in Hiles’ office during November, December and January. The Athletic Department’s decreased fundraising over that period — $1.3 million — is included in the total campus decline of $7.4 million.

Giving by smaller donors, defined as those who give less than $10,000, declined by about 5 percent in the three-month period, with drops in November and December somewhat offset by a January increase in giving. Small donors gave or pledged $4.76 million in the period, down from $5.02 million the previous year. “We definitely got hit in our annual fund and other points,” Hiles said. “It was rough because normally December is our best month.”

While his office fielded calls, Hiles said staff members researched callers who said they would never donate again. The result, he said, was “about a 90 percent correlation with people who ... have never given.”

The final word on other financial issues is unresolved. A House committee already has denied the university a portion of the budget increase allocated to other state colleges and universities. Chairwoman Donna Lichtenegger, R-Jackson, cited Click’s continued employment and a demonstration that interrupted a UM System Board of Curators meeting for the cut. At a Wednesday hearing of the Joint Committee on Education, interim MU Chancellor Hank Foley said figures show an anticipated enrollment drop of 900 students, which roughly equates to a $20 million loss of tuition revenue.

#### Protests skew investment policy and decrease perception of high returns which decrease donations

Cardarella 07 - Toni Cardarella, a freelance writer based in Kansas City, Mo., specializes in business and finance topics: July 1, 2007(“Endowment Politics When advancement strategies are defensive.” University Business Accessed on 12/15/16)IG

IT IS CERTAINLY MORE RARE than common for a university's actions, such as taking down a cross at a campus chapel or investing in companies that do business in Darfur, to directly affect donations, but that relationship-between behavior and endowments-is evolving, and some say the link may strengthen in the future.

"There clearly has been in the past couple years a kind of renewed interest in ethical, moral, and environmental ramifications of endowment investment," says David Bass, director of government relations and institutionally related foundations, at the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE). "I tend to think of that more through as sort of an activist push from students, faculty, and other stakeholders who say let's use them [investments] in a way that keeps with the institution's values, not compromise the institution ethically."

So what about a school's activities-do they or can they affect donation

"There are many things that happen on a college campus that can encourage or discourage an individual in terms of giving to an institution," says Sean Pieri, vice president for development at the College of William and Mary (Va.). It could be something as simple as their child not being admitted to the school. "It could be because of a policy decision," Pieri adds. "It could be investment strategy. It could be a curriculum change. The possibilities are endless.

Earlier this year, the decision to remove a cross from the College of William and Mary's Wren Chapel prompted a small number of alumni to say they would withhold donations to the public school. At the time, President Gene R. Nichol explained he had the cross removed from the chapel's altar so no one in the campus community would feel excluded. The cross couldbe replaced on request. Opponents said the removal dishonored the school's original Anglican roots. The estimated 18 William and Mary alumni who said they would not donate make up a small percentage of the college's donors.

According to the William and Mary Office of Development, nearly 16,000 donors gave $4.77 million in fiscal year 2006, including 10,677 alumni. Then on March 1, a donor withdrew a $10 million pledge he had made years earlier. Five days later, Nichol and the William and Mary Board of Visitors issued a joint statement saying the William and Mary Committee on Religion in a Public University recommended a compromise practice on the display of the altar cross in the Wren Chapel.

Pieri says it's important for development officers to pay attention to what alumni and other potential donors are saying but also know that not everyone is going to see eye to- eye on every action at the college. "As development officers, it's our responsibility to maintain relationships with people and understand that we will hear many differing opinions on a variety of issues and that a consensus opinion is rarely achievable," he says. "We understand we are developing relationships with individuals who are investing in the institution. Listen to their concerns and be open and honest with regard to the issues and understand that not everyone is going to agree."

Socially Responsible Investment Policies, or Not

"Not everyone is going to agree" is key to many IHEs' decisions to stay out of socially and politically charged issues when managing endowment investments, regardless of what current and former students think about it. But several schools in the last year or so decided to make exceptions to that thinking following organized campus protests over investments in companies supporting the ruling regime in the Darfur region of Sudan.

Earlier this year, the University of Colorado's (CU) Board of Regents departed from its "neutral investment policy" when it adopted its Sudan Divestment Policy, which directs the treasurer to recommend investment strategies for divestment from any companies operating "to the detriment of the Sudanese citizens." The move is contrary to a CU policy approved in 1996 that specifically stated social issues would not be a factor in investment strategies. "The university took a bold step years ago saying we're not going to consider any social issues, and [investment] managers, you're not allowed to consider any social issues," says Chris Bittman, chief investment officer for the University of Colorado Foundation.

'Generally our policy is to ignore issues that people who have reasonable intelligence can disagree on.'

-Don Eldhart, University of Colorado

While the foundation's investment policy statement doesn't speak to any socially responsible issues, the foundation "by default" follows the CU policy, passed by the board in January. The resolution, approved in December 2006, followed a student led campaign claiming the funds support genocide in Darfur. "As a money manager for the university, just like any other money manager would be, we would be asked to abide by that policy. And the policy is pretty clear," Bittman says. The policy directs the foundation treasurer to recommend financially equivalent alternatives for divestment from Sudan. "We've completely met the spirit and intent of the university policy," Bittman adds.

-Don Eldhart, University of Colorado

Recalling the decision-making process, CU Treasurer Don Eldhart says the board decided to divest from companies in Sudan and depart from its neutral policy because it felt the issue is more than a political one. "Generally our policy is to ignore issues that people who have reasonable intelligence can disagree on," Eldhart says. But genocide is an exception to this, he adds, out of the realm of Asian sweatshops-another socially charged issue on U.S. campuses. "There isn't anybody who's going to take the case that genocide is good," he says.

Brown, Harvard, Princeton, Stanford, Yale, the University of Illinois system, and Wheaton College (Mass.) are among the institutions that have announced they will no longer invest in companies that do business with the Sudanese government. But not every school decided to change policy after the protests. The University of Chicago, with an endowment valued at $4.86 billion last year, said in a February statement that it would stick to its "long-standing practice of not taking explicit positions on social and political issues that do not have a direct bearing on the university."

"I understand that the decision not to divest will be a disappointment to some, especially to the students who have given great time, thought, and energy to their proposal," University of Chicago President Robert J. Zimmer said in a statement announcing the decision. "At the same time, the campus deliberations on this topic have reaffirmed for me the extraordinary value in our university's commitment to engaging the broadest range of perspectives." But he said the board "shared the widely held view that the university should seek to identify means to contribute to greater understanding of the conflict in Sudan in ways consonant with the university's mission, with the hope of adding value to ongoing efforts to end this international crisis." Zimmer said he had established a $200,000 fund to support faculty and student work and activities on those issues.

Do Donors Care?

Whether donors or potential donors see the new University of Colorado divestment policy as a positive move is not clear- neither Bittman nor Eldhart has heard of anyone not donating due to the previous neutral policy. Eldhart says he figures CU investment policies matter to about 20 percent of the endowment cases and may be a strong issue in about 10 percent. "Not a lot of people are thinking about that when they're donating," he says, whether to the University of Colorado or to any university or college.

A Goldman Sachs Global Marketing Institution survey in January 2005 that looked at public perceptions of university endowments showed most donors (70 percent) see yielding the highest possible return as the top priority. Sixty-four percent of those surveyed said avoiding investments that are out of step with a university's values is a top or high priority, and 44 percent said it was a high or top priority that investments were socially responsible, such as environment-friendly.

### Link – Partisan Donors

#### *[to read this link, draw a line from their ev that rejects corporate influence or biased donors]*

#### Promoting free speech on colleges would entail rejecting endowments from partisan donors

Kurtz 15 [Stanley Kurtz, senior fellow at the Ethics and Public Policy Center and a former adjunct fellow with Hudson Institute,“A Plan to Restore Free Speech on Campus,” The National Review, December 7, 2015, http://www.nationalreview.com/corner/428122/plan-restore-free-speech-campus-stanley-kurtz] JW

Fifth: Colleges and universities ought to adopt policies on institutional political neutrality based on the University of Chicago’s Kalven Committee Report of 1967. The Kalven Report explains that the ability of a university to foster political dissent and criticism by faculty and students actually depends upon the political neutrality of the institution itself. The principles of academic freedom and institutional neutrality embodied in the Kalven Report are the surest antidote to demands that universities divest themselves of stock in fossil-fuel providers, Israeli companies, and other political targets. Advocates who attempt to inject universities into the political process by means of their endowments substantially inhibit the intellectual freedom of faculty and students who wish to explore contrary points of view. The National Association of Scholars’ recent reports on campus sustainability and fossil-fuel divestment detail the illiberal implications of these movements. The American Council of Trustees and Alumni includes the text of the Kalven Report and an excellent commentary by civil libertarian attorney Harvey Silverglate in its guide to academic freedom. Trustees should take note.

## Uniqueness

### 2NR – Uniqueness Wall [Donations]

#### Donations increasing across the US

Lorin 16 [Janet Lorin (reporter), "U.S. Universities Raised a Record $40.3 Billion Last Year," Bloomberg News, 1/26/2016] AZ

Donors see the impact these gifts can make, “not just on the institution, but on the world,” Morton Schapiro, Northwestern’s president, said in a phone interview. “They are excited about what you could do with their money: bold, new strategic plans that can really transform not only the university, but allow us to do a much better job in our public missions.” The other $100 million and more gifts went to the University of California-San Francisco, which ranked fourth with $608.6 million, and Princeton University, according to the survey. Princeton raised the eighth-largest amount, $549.8 million, which included its largest gift ever -- 2,500 rare books and manuscripts valued at $300 million. In the year ended June 2014, schools received five gifts of $100 million or larger, a total of almost $700 million, according to the survey. The survey asks schools for the top three donors in four categories -- by a living individual, a bequest, companies and foundations. Schools in the top 10 also included the University of Southern California with $653 million; Cornell University, $590.6 million; Johns Hopkins University, $582.7 million; Columbia University, $552.7 million; and the University of Pennsylvania, $517.2 million, according to the survey. Gifts from alumni increased 10.2 percent to $10.9 billion, and non-alumni donations rose 23.1 percent to $8 billion, according to the survey. Charitable support from foundations including family foundations increased 3.6 percent while corporate giving was flat. Contributions to schools’ operations increased 13 percent, according to the survey. Gifts for capital purposes, such as endowments, property or buildings, were flat.

#### Our ev takes into account public colleges – the study surveyed them and extrapolated the trends to all universities in the US

#### Public colleges specifically are receiving more donations – here a few examples

#### UCLA

Lee 16 [Cynthia Lee (reporter), "UCLA sets fundraising record with $664 million in 2015–16," UCLA Newsroom, 7/28/2016] AZ

For the third year in a row, UCLA shattered its fundraising record, receiving a total of $664 million in gifts and pledges in the fiscal year that ended June 30. Donations of all sizes came in during 2015–16 from a record 61,740 donors to support an array of priorities, including undergraduate scholarships, endowed professorships and graduate student fellowships. Approximately 95 percent of the total number of gifts were for less than $10,000. The last fiscal year marked the fourth consecutive year of growth in philanthropic giving for the university. This auspicious achievement came as the Centennial Campaign for UCLA reached the halfway point. The $4.2 billion campaign was publicly launched in May 2014 and is scheduled to conclude in 2019 during UCLA’s 100th anniversary year. “I am extremely gratified by the overwhelming generosity shown by tens of thousands of people around the world who share our vision for UCLA’s next century,” said Rhea Turteltaub, UCLA vice chancellor for external affairs. “The success of this campaign is due largely to the diligent efforts of many volunteers, faculty, staff, alumni and friends who are committed to helping the campus shape its future.” The $664 million total broke the previous record high of $644 million set in 2014-15. UCLA raised $557 million in 2013–14 and $507 million in 2012–13. Including a private phase that began in July 2012, the Centennial Campaign has now raised more than $2.7 billion — 65 percent of its goal of $4.2 billion. The single largest donation of $100 million in 2015–16 came from the David Geffen Foundation to help UCLA establish a new secondary school, the Geffen Academy at UCLA, that will provide an innovative college preparatory education for Los Angeles-area students in grades 6 through 12. The donation provides immediate support for facility renovations, faculty and curriculum development, and other key strategic tasks needed to launch the school on the Westwood campus. In all, donors from 50 states and 61 countries made 79,422 gifts to UCLA in the last fiscal year. More than 17,500 of these donors were giving to the university for the first time. Alumni donors represented 65 percent of all who donated.

#### Berkeley

Smith 16 [Brenna Smith (senior staff reporter), "UC Berkeley receives record number of alumni donations this year," Daily Californian, 7/17/2016] AZ

During the 2015-16 academic year, UC Berkeley patrons and alumni gave campus a record number of donations amid concerns about declining state funding. According to an email statement from UC Berkeley Chancellor Nicholas Dirks, campus received $479.1 million from over 65,300 donors, a $16.6 million increase from the previous year. The growth occurred soon after the start of a major campus initiative, Fundraising 2.0, which is geared toward improving the donor experience at UC Berkeley. “I’d love to say that (Fundraising 2.0) was the cause of the record,” said campus Assistant Vice Chancellor Irene Kim. “But I don’t know if I can claim that because a lot of these things take time to fully take hold.” In the spring of 2015, former Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Claude Steele and Vice Chancellor Julie Hooper launched the initiative along with a list of guiding principles for campus fundraising. One major area of improvement, Kim said, was helping the various campus schools and colleges fundraise in a “coordinated effort.” According to Kim, a single donor often pledged money not only to a college or school, but also to programs such as athletic teams and on-campus museums. Donors wanted these various programs to be more “coordinated internally” and not have every program reach out individually for donations, Kim said. “We’ve gone through a major transition because so many of our alumni graduated at a time when Cal was really state supported,” Kim said, adding that UC Berkeley relies more on donations now than ever before.

#### Virginia

Diver 11/11 [Derik Diver, "Faulders to retire as UVA Alumni Association President," UVA Magazine, 11/11/2016] AZ

Among Faulders’ accomplishments was repairing the once-strained relationship between the Association and the University. A testament to that, the Association officially became the gift-processing center for the University last April, taking over the back-office administration of the high volume of donations and pledges UVA receives. A member of UVA President Teresa Sullivan’s cabinet, Faulders currently has a leadership role in the University’s upcoming bicentennial celebration and serves on multiple University committees.

#### Michigan

Basha 10/20 [Riyah Basha, "Regents announce record high investment in research funding, endowments," Michigan Daily, 10/20/2016] AZ

S. Jack Hu, the University’s vice president for research, announced that the amount of research funding received by the University rose to a record volume of $1.39 billion in fiscal year 2016, marking a 7.2 percent increase in the last year. Much of the increase in funding, according to a University press release, comes from growth in contracts with federal agencies like the Department for Health and Human Services and the Department of Defense. “The growing investment in U-M research is a measure of the continuing confidence of our sponsors in the value that our faculty and students bring to society,” Hu said in the release. Executive officers also highlighted donations to research initiatives, most notably a $10.75 million gift from University alumni Frances and Kenneth Eisenberg to develop personalized treatments at the Depression Center. The research is the first ever multidisciplinary effort to bring together the research, education and treatment of depressive and bipolar illnesses. During the meeting, University President Mark Schlissel thanked the Eisenberg family and said the center’s work is pivotal to addressing access to mental health services on campus.

### A2 Low Endowments [ACE]

#### Their card is misleading – many public colleges might lack funds stored in their endowments, but still rely on donations to run day-to-day operations and fund the construction of new buildings, which their ev doesn't account for

#### Irrelevant – we've won that donations are rapidly increasing now, even if endowments are low

### U – Military Colleges

#### Gifts increasing to military academies

Tumulty 15 [Brian Tumulty (reporter), "U.S. Military Academy sees big rise in charitable gifts," USA Today, 2/1/2015] AZ

Charitable gifts to the U.S. Military Academy jumped 37 percent last year, and donors also gave more generously to other Hudson Valley colleges, according to a report released last week. Charitable gifts to the West Point Association of Graduates topped $52.62 million in the 2013-14 fiscal year that ended June 30, up from $38.29 million in 2012-13.

### U – Protests Low

#### Protests are decreasing

Victor 16 [Yale News, "Yale, Claremont McKenna and Mizzou," 4/28/2016] AZ

One attendee, Director of Residential Life Frankie Minor, tells me it’s his first time going to such an event, and he hadn’t come in with any expectations about attendance.

“It’s St. Patrick’s Day on a college campus,” he says. This is what the situation looks like now that The New York Times, The Washington Post and other major media outlets have packed up and left the University of Missouri just as quickly as they came. Mel Carnahan Quadrangle, which is right outside, would now be unrecognizable to most people without the tent city and masses of students once pictured all over the national media. Students stroll unceremoniously across the quad; it could be that of any campus in America. Last fall, a string of protests took place, revolving around incidents of racism at Mizzou. The final and most intense protest ended with a weeklong hunger strike, a threat by the football team to boycott a game and the resignation of two of the University of Missouri System’s top administrators. But the protests have died down in recent months, as conversations on campus race relations move to closed meetings of university decision-makers and open campuswide forums like the one I’m attending.

## Turns Case

### Turns Education

#### Endowments are key to education quality

ACE 14 ["Understanding College and University Endowments," American Council on Education, 2014] AZ

An endowment is an aggregation of assets invested by a college or university to support its educational mission in perpetuity. An institution’s endowment actually comprises hundreds or thousands of individual endowments. An endowment allows donors to transfer their private dollars to public purposes with the assurance that their gifts will serve these purposes for as long as the institution continues to exist. An endowment represents a compact between a donor and an institution. It links past, current, and future generations. It also allows an institution to make commitments far into the future, knowing that resources to meet those commitments will continue to be available. Endowments serve institutions and the public by: • Providing stability. College and university revenues fluctuate over time with changes in enrollment (tuition), donor interest (gifts), and public (largely state and federal) support. Although endowment earnings also vary with changes in financial markets and investment strategies, most institutions follow prudent guidelines (spending rates) to buffer economic fluctuations that are intended to produce a relatively stable stream of income. Since endowment principal is not spent, the interest generated by endowment earnings supports institutional priorities year after year. This kind of stability is especially important for activities that cannot readily be started and stopped, or for which fluctuating levels of support could be costly or debilitating. Endowments frequently support student aid, faculty positions, innovative academic programs, medical research, and libraries. • Leveraging other sources of revenue. In recent years, as the economy has been severely stressed, institutions have dramatically increased their own student aid expenditures, and endowments have enabled institutions to respond more fully to changing demographics and families’ financial need. It is not surprising that the colleges and universities with the largest endowments are also the ones most likely to offer needblind admission (admitting students without regard to financial circumstances and then providing enough financial aid to enable those admitted to attend). An endowment also allows a college or university to provide a higher level of quality or service at a lower price than would otherwise be possible. This has been especially important in recent years, particularly for publicly supported institutions that have experienced significant cuts in state support. Without endowments or other private gifts, institutions would have had to cut back even further on their programs, levy even greater increases in their prices to students, and/or obtain additional public funding to maintain current programs at current prices. Encouraging innovation and flexibility. An endowment enables faculty and students to conduct innovative research, explore new academic fields, apply new technologies, and develop new teaching methods even if funding is not readily available from other sources, including tuition, gifts, or grants. Such innovation and flexibility has led to entirely new programs and to important discoveries in science, medicine, education, and other fields. • Allowing a longer time horizon. Unlike gifts expended upon receipt, an endowed gift keeps giving over time. Endowed institutions can plan strategically to use a more reliable stream of earnings to strengthen and enhance the quality of their programs, even if many years will be required to achieve some of their goals. By making endowed gifts, alumni and others take responsibility for ensuring the long-term well-being of colleges and universities; their gifts help enable future generations of students to benefit from a higher quality of education and allow these institutions to make even greater contributions to the public good

### Turns Innovations

#### Endowments key to college quality – staff training, innovation, and research funding

AAU 9 [Association of American Universities, "MYTHS ABOUT COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ENDOWMENTS," January 2009] AZ

American colleges and universities are tax-exempt organizations because of the educational and research purposes for which they exist, which directly benefit citizens and society. Endowments are tax-exempt because their primary purpose is to directly support and sustain teaching, research, and public service. These comprise the core of a research university’s mission. Endowments are a vital source of revenue that makes possible a university’s contributions to the public good. The effects of higher education – the educated student now in the workforce, the research breakthroughs and the new technology we use daily, the lives saved through medical research, the solutions to community problems – can be seen in every aspect of society: health, business, manufacturing, arts and culture, national security, and government. Universities are also home to much of the innovation that fuels America’s status as a superpower. University research leads to new technologies that, in turn, create new industries and economic growth. The Internet, Google, and GPS technology are just a few examples of the innovations whose origins are in universities. American universities have contributed significantly to the nation’s economic growth and are the envy of other countries. Locally, communities with universities benefit considerably from university activities, which are partly funded by endowment income. These benefits include research that drives economic development, community outreach to area schools, access to university libraries and museums, jobs, and the delivery of generations of highly-skilled and educated workers. Additionally, university medical centers – which are also supported in part by endowed funds – offer top-notch treatment and care to citizens of their host communities.

### Turns Racism

#### larger endowments help disadvantaged students pay for college

AAU 9 [Association of American Universities, "MYTHS ABOUT COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ENDOWMENTS," January 2009] AZ

MYTH: Universities are not using enough of their endowments to make college accessible and affordable for low- and middle-income students. The cost of a college education is much higher for all students than the tuition prices charged by institutions. For college and universities with sizable endowments, the difference is subsidized by earnings from their endowments. The extensive aid colleges and universities extend to students from low- and middle-income families, which often covers tuition, books and living expenses, helps ensure that a top-quality education remains a path to the American dream. Many institutions with significant endowments are making this dream possible by converting loans to grants and by making college free for thousands of low- and moderate-income students (students from families with incomes below $40,000, and in some cases below $60,000 or $70,000 a year). Some of these institutions are: the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; Emory University; Vanderbilt University; the University of Washington; Stanford University; the University of Maryland at College Park; Princeton University; the University of Florida; Yale University; the University of Pennsylvania; Indiana University; Harvard University; Texas A&M University; Columbia University; and the University of Virginia. At these and many other institutions, financial aid is not just for low-income students. Middle income students are also offered significant financial support to help make college affordable, including grant aid to help reduce post-graduation debt. In addition to financial aid, universities conduct a variety of outreach programs to attract low-income applicants. These extensive outreach efforts include sending school representatives to low-income communities, paying for low-income high school students to visit the campus, and waiving application fees.

## Impacts

### Impact – Competitiveness

#### Endowment funds are key to US competitiveness – ensures college quality

Leigh 14 [Steven R. Leigh (dean of CU-Boulder’s College of Arts and Sciences), "Endowments and the future of higher education," UColorado Boulder, March 2014] AZ

These broad trends point directly to the need for CU-Boulder’s College of Arts and Sciences to increase endowment funding across the college. Endowments drive improvements in the quality of an institution and reflect alums, donors and supporters who recognize the importance of research universities in the 21st century. Endowed professorships are the first and most important component of increasing our academic quality. Named chairs recognize significant faculty achievements and help the university support faculty salary and research. CU-Boulder professors are among the most productive in the nation and are heavily recruited by competitors, including Harvard, Yale, Stanford, Cornell, Berkeley, Illinois, UC Irvine and many others. Often, these competitors offer our faculty endowed professorships, conferring prestige and research support. CU must provide its faculty with comparable support to be competitive. A second major area for endowments is student scholarships and, for graduate students, fellowships. A stable source of income that helps pay tuition is the most direct and effective way to offset the costs of education. Endowed scholarships are also effective recruiting tools for admitting the nation’s best to CU. Our dynamic programs, departments and majors are attracting more and more applicants, including the best in the nation. Like faculty support, endowed scholarships and fellowships confer prestige and, most importantly, allow students to focus entirely on academics without balancing jobs and worrying about future loan repayments. Finally, endowment funding for programs greatly enriches the institution, providing capabilities that are difficult to attain when tuition revenue provides the majority of funding. Institutions funded mainly by tuition must make sure that expenditures directly benefit students, which sometimes limits options for innovation and risk-taking. Programmatic funding enables faculty and students to take risks in their research and creative work. For example, in my own field, this might involve traveling to an unexplored region to prospect for human fossils or archaeological sites. Support for high-risk projects allows our faculty and students to develop new areas of knowledge, benefitting society by broadening the capacity of the institution to innovate. The future of higher education, including CU’s future, depends to a large degree on how successfully we can build major endowments. Ultimately, U.S. competitiveness and leadership in the global knowledge economy depends on this as well. For alums, donors and supporters, endowments indelibly affirm the importance of higher education and enduringly preserve its viability and vitality.

#### Innovation solves great power war

Taylor 4 – Professor of Political Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (Mark, “The Politics of Technological Change: International Relations versus Domestic Institutions,” Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 4/1/2004, <http://www.scribd.com/doc/46554792/Taylor>) //RGP

I. Introduction Technological innovation is of central importance to the study of international relations (IR), affecting almost every aspect of the sub-field. First and foremost, a nation’s technological capability has a significant effect on its economic growth, industrial might, and military prowess; therefore relative national technological capabilities necessarily influence the balance of power between states, and hence have a role in calculations of war and alliance formation. Second, technology and innovative capacity also determine a nation’s trade profile, affecting which products it will import and export, as well as where multinational corporations will base their production facilities. Third, insofar as innovation-driven economic growth both attracts investment and produces surplus capital, a nation’s technological ability will also affect international financial flows and who has power over them. Thus, in broad theoretical terms, technological change is important to the study of IR because of its overall implications for both the relative and absolute power of states. And if theory alone does not convince, then history also tells us that nations on the technological ascent generally experience a corresponding and dramatic change in their global stature and influence, such as Britain during the first industrial revolution, the United States and Germany during the second industrial revolution, and Japan during the twentieth century. Conversely, great powers which fail to maintain their place at the technological frontier generally drift and fade from influence on international scene. This is not to suggest that technological innovation alone determines international politics, but rather that shifts in both relative and absolute technological capability have a major impact on international relations, and therefore need to be better understood by IR scholars. Indeed, the importance of technological innovation to international relations is seldom disputed by IR theorists. Technology is rarely the sole or overriding causal variable in any given IR theory, but a broad overview of the major theoretical debates reveals the ubiquity of technological causality. For example, from Waltz to Posen, almost all Realists have a place for technology in their explanations of international politics. At the very least, they describe it as an essential part of the distribution of material capabilities across nations, or an indirect source of military doctrine. And for some, like Gilpin quoted above, technology is the very cornerstone of great power domination, and its transfer the main vehicle by which war and change occur in world politics. Jervis tells us that the balance of offensive and defensive military technology affects the incentives for war. Walt agrees, arguing that technological change can alter a state’s aggregate power, and thereby affect both alliance formation and the international balance of threats. Liberals are less directly concerned with technological change, but they must admit that by raising or lowering the costs of using force, technological progress affects the rational attractiveness of international cooperation and regimes. Technology also lowers information & transactions costs and thus increases the applicability of international institutions, a cornerstone of Liberal IR theory. And in fostering flows of trade, finance, and information, technological change can lead to Keohane’s interdependence or Thomas Friedman et al’s globalization. Meanwhile, over at the “third debate”, Constructivists cover the causal spectrum on the issue, from Katzenstein’s “cultural norms” which shape security concerns and thereby affect technological innovation; to Wendt’s “stripped down technological determinism” in which technology inevitably drives nations to form a world state. However most Constructivists seem to favor Wendt, arguing that new technology changes people’s identities within society, and sometimes even creates new cross-national constituencies, thereby affecting international politics. Of course, Marxists tend to see technology as determining all social relations and the entire course of history, though they describe mankind’s major fault lines as running between economic classes rather than nation-states. Finally, Buzan & Little remind us that without advances in the technologies of transportation, communication, production, and war, international systems would not exist in the first place.

### Impact – Econ Growth

#### Krugman is wrong — competitiveness is real and necessary for economic growth.

Ezell 11 — Stephen Ezell, Senior Analyst with the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation—a non-partisan research and educational institute and think tank whose mission is to formulate and promote public policies to advance technological innovation and productivity, former head of the Global Service Innovation Consortium at Peer Insight—an innovation research and consulting firm, holds a B.S. from the School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University with an Honors Certificate from Georgetown’s Landegger International Business Diplomacy program, 2011 (“Krugman Flat Wrong that Competitiveness is a Myth,” *The Innovation Files*, January 25th, Available Online at http://www.innovationfiles.org/krugman-flat-wrong-that-competitiveness-is-a-myth/, Accessed 08-11-2013)

In a Sunday op-ed in the New York Times, “The Competition Myth,” Paul Krugman argues that “competitiveness” is a myth, a bad metaphor, a fundamentally misleading goal, and that it doesn’t make “any sense to view our current woes as stemming from a lack of competitiveness.” About this, Krugman is absolutely, dead-on, 100 percent wrong. For the reality is that the perilous state of the American economy has everything to do with faltering U.S. competitiveness—and more than that—much to do with the abject refusal of neoclassical economists like Krugman himself to recognize that competitiveness is an issue, that countries compete, and that U.S. economic policy should be directly designed to bolster the competitiveness of U.S. organizations and industries.

Krugman’s like the young boy who finds himself losing a race with his buddies and who stops and yells, “I’m not racing!” Better to simply pretend that you aren’t racing than to lose. For if you can convince yourself that you aren’t in a race, you sure sleep better at night than if you admitted you were in a competition and were losing…That is, until you wake up one morning having lost ten million manufacturing jobs, have 10% unemployment, and have a horrifically bad trade balance. Moreover, when you refuse to even believe that you’re in a race, it’s a sure sign that you’re going to lose, as evidenced by the fact that the United States ranks 40th of out of 40 countries and regions in improving its innovation competitiveness over the past decade, as ITIF’s Atlantic Century report found.

#### Strong *relative* growth is crucial to maintain U.S. military power.

Manzi 11 — Jim Manzi, Senior Fellow at the Manhattan Institute, Chief Executive Officer of Applied Predictive Technologies—an applied artificial intelligence software company, holds a B.S. in Mathematics from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2011 (“On Not Ceding ‘Competitiveness’ to the Left,” *National Review Online*, September 16th, Available Online at http://www.nationalreview.com/corner/277406/not-ceding-competitiveness-left-jim-manzi, Accessed 08-11-2013)

An idiosyncrasy of contemporary American political debate is that concern with “competitiveness” is so often associated with the Democratic party, and is often used as a code word for industrial policy and a host of social engineering initiatives. I think it is a mistake for the right to concede this territory.

You link to a quote from Paul Krugman, supposedly discrediting the idea of national competitiveness:

International trade, unlike competition among businesses for a limited market, is not a zero-sum game in which one nation’s gain is another’s loss. It is [a] positive-sum game, which is why the word “competitiveness” can be dangerously misleading when applied to international trade.

But this doesn’t make a lot of sense to me. Sure, some product markets are somewhat limited, but competition between companies as a whole is not generally “zero-sum” either — hence, economic growth.

International trade can make both parties better off than they would be without the exchange. But there are still relative winners and losers. Some societies are populated by lots of people with high-wage jobs, nice houses, and good schools, and other societies are populated by lots of people hustling for tips from vacationers from the first kind of society. Over time, people who spend their working hours generating goods or services that they can sell for a big margin versus the costs of the required inputs will tend to live in the first kind of society. Nothing is forever in this world, but I want America to remain in that camp for a very long time.

In the most important sense, competitiveness is relative productivity. And relative productivity is likely to matter a lot, because it will materially influence future absolute wealth by affecting the flow of global technology and innovation. But relative productivity and the wealth wealth it produces also matter in and of themselves. First, they will impact the global prestige and success of the Western idea of the open society which we value independently of its economic benefits — people naturally look to economically successful societies for lessons and inspiration. Second, maintenance of a very large GDP per capita gap between the West and the rest of the world will be essential to maintaining relative Western aggregate GDP, and therefore, long-run military power.

In sum, we want the rest of the world to get richer, but we want to stay much richer than they get.

#### Maintaining strong economic growth is vital to prevent great power conflict — *relative* growth is key.

Goldstein 7 — Avery Goldstein, David M. Knott Professor of Global Politics and International Relations at the University of Pennsylvania, Associate Director of the Christopher H. Browne Center for International Politics, Senior Fellow at the Foreign Policy Research Institute, holds a Ph.D. from the University of California-Berkeley, 2007 (“Power transitions, institutions, and China's rise in East Asia: Theoretical expectations and evidence,” *Journal of Strategic Studies*, Volume 30, Number 4-5, August-October, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via Taylor & Francis Online, p. 647-648)

Two closely related, though distinct, theoretical arguments focus explicitly on the consequences for international politics of a shift in power between a dominant state and a rising power. In War and Change in World Politics, Robert Gilpin suggested that peace prevails when a dominant state’s capabilities enable it to ‘govern’ an international order that it has shaped. Over time, however, as economic and technological diffusion proceeds during eras of peace and development, other states are empowered. Moreover, the burdens of international governance drain and distract the reigning hegemon, and challengers eventually emerge who seek to rewrite the rules of governance. As the power advantage of the erstwhile hegemon ebbs, it may become desperate enough to resort to the ultima ratio of international politics, force, to forestall the increasingly urgent demands of a rising challenger. Or as the power of the challenger rises, it may be tempted to press its case with threats to use force. It is the rise and fall of the great powers that creates the circumstances under which major wars, what Gilpin labels ‘hegemonic wars’, break out.13

Gilpin’s argument logically encourages pessimism about the implications of a rising China. It leads to the expectation that international trade, investment, and technology transfer will result in a steady diffusion of American economic power, benefiting the rapidly developing states of the world, including China. As the US simultaneously scurries to put out the many brushfires that threaten its far-flung global interests (i.e., the classic problem of overextension), it will be unable to devote sufficient resources to maintain or restore its former advantage over emerging competitors like China. While the erosion of the once clear American advantage plays itself out, the US will find it ever more difficult to preserve the order in Asia that it created during its era of preponderance. The expectation is an increase in the likelihood for the use of force – either by a Chinese challenger able to field a stronger military in support of its demands for greater influence over international arrangements in Asia, or by a besieged American hegemon desperate to head off further decline. Among the trends that alarm [end page 647] those who would look at Asia through the lens of Gilpin’s theory are China’s expanding share of world trade and wealth (much of it resulting from the gains made possible by the international economic order a dominant US established); its acquisition of technology in key sectors that have both civilian and military applications (e.g., information, communications, and electronics linked with the ‘revolution in military affairs’); and an expanding military burden for the US (as it copes with the challenges of its global war on terrorism and especially its struggle in Iraq) that limits the resources it can devote to preserving its interests in East Asia.14

Although similar to Gilpin’s work insofar as it emphasizes the importance of shifts in the capabilities of a dominant state and a rising challenger, the power-transition theory A. F. K. Organski and Jacek Kugler present in The War Ledger focuses more closely on the allegedly dangerous phenomenon of ‘crossover’– the point at which a dissatisfied challenger is about to overtake the established leading state.15 In such cases, when the power gap narrows, the dominant state becomes increasingly desperate to forestall, and the challenger becomes increasingly determined to realize the transition to a new international order whose contours it will define.

### I/L – Competitiveness K2 Growth

#### Government policies are needed to support innovation and global competitiveness — Krugman is wrong.

Ezell 11 — Stephen Ezell, Senior Analyst with the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation—a non-partisan research and educational institute and think tank whose mission is to formulate and promote public policies to advance technological innovation and productivity, former head of the Global Service Innovation Consortium at Peer Insight—an innovation research and consulting firm, holds a B.S. from the School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University with an Honors Certificate from Georgetown’s Landegger International Business Diplomacy program, 2011 (“Krugman Flat Wrong that Competitiveness is a Myth,” *The Innovation Files*, January 25th, Available Online at http://www.innovationfiles.org/krugman-flat-wrong-that-competitiveness-is-a-myth/, Accessed 08-11-2013)

Krugman’s misguided perspective on competitiveness dates back to a 1994 Foreign Affairs article he wrote, “Competitiveness, A Dangerous Obsession,” in which he made the utterly astounding contention that, “The notion that nations compete is incorrect…countries are not to any important degree in competition with each other.” Like many U.S. elites, Krugman simply refuses to recognize that the U.S. is in global economic—and innovation—competition with other nations. This view remains readily apparent in the NYT article, where Krugman contends that “we’re in a mess because we had a financial crisis, not because American companies have lost their ability to compete with foreign rivals.” Krugman goes on, “But isn’t it at least somewhat useful to think of our nation as if it were America Inc., competing in the global marketplace? No.” So again, only companies compete with one another; and it’s not helpful to think of the U.S. as competing. Moreover, our companies are competing fine…so the problem must be a financial crisis (caused by a few malfeasant firms in the financial sector).

But the reality is that countries do compete and seek to win in the highest-value-added sectors of economic activity. In fact, Krugman dramatically underestimates the impact that countries’ strategies—whether fair and consistent with global rules or not—can have in shifting comparative advantage in critical technology-based sectors their way. There are two aspects to this competition worth discussing.

First, an increasingly globalized economy means that countries have become price takers—not price makers—on international markets. In other words, companies now shop the world for the best locations to situate their globally mobile innovation activity, such as where to locate R&D facilities or build new factories. These companies look for which countries offer the best pools of talent (skilled scientists and engineers and a highly educated, highly skilled populace); which have the most attractive tax laws in terms of low corporate tax rates and generous and stable R&D tax credits; which have the most robust physical and digital infrastructures, the latter especially in terms of fixed and mobile broadband, electric smart grids, or intelligent transportation systems; which have the best high-skill immigration policies; the deepest pools of capital; the best funding for R&D; the easiest place to start a business; etc.. Collectively, these attributes constitute a nation’s innovation ecosystem, and governments play a legitimate and crucial role in shaping their nation’s innovation ecosystem. In fact, it is these innovation ecosystems on which countries increasingly compete. As Greg Tassey, a Senior Economist at the Department of Commerce National Institute of Standards and Technology argues, “Competition among governments has become a critical factor in determining which economies win and which lose in the increasingly intense process of creative destruction.”

But Krugman refuses to see this because “only companies compete.” This raises a consequent challenge again explained by Tassey: “Another underlying problem is that U.S. firms are attempting to compete largely as independent entities against a growing number of national economies in Europe and Asia in which government, industry, and a broad infrastructure (technical, education, economic, and information) are evolving into increasingly effective technology-based ecosystems.” Or as Wayne Johnson, Hewlett Packard’s Director of Worldwide Strategic University Customer Relations, said at a 2008 conference, “We in the United States find ourselves in competition not only with individuals, companies, and private institutions, but also with governments and mixed government-private collaborations.” In other words, the United States has a collection of players (businesses) running around competing against other players (nations) that are well equipped, well coached, and running specific plays.

### I/L – Education K2 Competitiveness

#### Education promotes global competitiveness, power, and a more productive world

Duncan 10 – Arne Duncan is an American education administrator who has been United States Secretary of Education since 2009, 2010 (“The Vision of Education Reform in the United States: Secretary Arne Duncan's Remarks to United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO),” Paris, France, Department of Education, 11-4-2010, available online via http://www.ed.gov/news/speeches/vision-education-reform-united-states-secretary-arne-duncans-remarks-united-nations-educational-scientific-and-cultural-organization-unesco-paris-france, accessed on 7-8-2015)//CM

It is an absolute honor to address UNESCO. During the last 65 years, UNESCO has done so much to advance the cause of education and gender equity, alleviate poverty, and promote peace. When UNESCO was founded in 1945, much of Europe, Russia, and Japan lay in ruin. The promise of universal education was then a lonely beacon—a light to guide the way to peace and the rebuilding of nations across the globe. Today, the world is no longer recovering from a tragic global war. Yet the international community faces a crisis of a different sort, the global economic crisis. And education is still the beacon lighting the path forward—perhaps more so today than ever before. Education is still the key to eliminating gender inequities, to reducing poverty, to creating a sustainable planet, and to fostering peace. And in a knowledge economy, education is the new currency by which nations maintain economic competitiveness and global prosperity. I want to provide two overarching messages today about America's efforts to boost educational attainment and achievement. First, the Obama administration has an ambitious and unified theory of action that propels our agenda. The challenge of transforming education in America cannot be met by quick-fix solutions or isolated reforms. It can only be accomplished with a clear, coherent, and coordinated vision of reform. Second, while America must improve its stagnant educational and economic performance, President Obama and I reject the protectionist Cold War-era assumption that improving economic competitiveness is somehow a zero-sum game, with one nation's gain being another country's loss. I want to make the case to you today that enhancing educational attainment and economic viability, both at home and abroad, is really more of a win-win game; it is an opportunity to grow the economic pie, instead of carve it up. As President Obama said in his speech to the Muslim world in Cairo last year, "Any world order that elevates one nation or group of people over another will inevitably fail." There is so much that the United States has to learn from nations with high-performing education systems. And there is so much that America can share from its experience to the mutual benefit of nations confronting similar educational challenges. I am convinced that the U.S. education system now has an unprecedented opportunity to get dramatically better. Nothing—nothing—is more important in the long-run to American prosperity than boosting the skills and attainment of the nation's students. In the United States, we feel an economic and moral imperative to challenge the status quo. Closing the achievement gap and closing the opportunity gap is the civil rights issue of our generation. One quarter of U.S. high school students drop out or fail to graduate on time. Almost one million students leave our schools for the streets each year. That is economically unsustainable and morally unacceptable. One of the more unusual and sobering press conferences I participated in last year was the release of a report by a group of top retired generals and admirals. Here was the stunning conclusion of their report: 75 percent of young Americans, between the ages of 17 to 24, are unable to enlist in the military today because they have failed to graduate from high school, have a criminal record, or are physically unfit. Now, everyone here today knows that education is taking on more and more importance around the globe. In the last decade, international competition in higher education and the job market has grown dramatically. As the New York Times columnist Thomas Friedman famously pointed out, the world economy has indeed "flattened." Companies now digitize, automate, and outsource work to the most competitive individuals, companies, and countries. In the knowledge economy, opportunities to land a good job are vanishing fast for young workers who drop out of school or fail to get college experience. That is why President Obama often says that the nation that "out-educates us today is going to out-compete us tomorrow." Yet there is also a paradox at the heart of America's efforts to bolster international competitiveness. To succeed in the global economy, the United States, just like other nations, will have to become both more economically competitive and more collaborative. In the information age, more international competition has spawned more international collaboration. Today, education is a global public good unconstrained by national boundaries. In the United States, for example, concerns are sometimes raised about the large number of foreign-born students earning masters and doctorates in science and engineering fields. Immigrants now constitute nearly half of America's PhD scientists and engineers, even though they constitute only 12 percent of the workforce overall. These foreign-born students more often return to the country of origin than in the past. But their scientific skills and entrepreneurship strengthen not only their native economy but also stimulate innovation and new markets that can help boost the U.S. economy. The same borderless nature of innovation and ideas is evident when foreign-born students remain in America. Immigrants to the U.S. started a quarter of all engineering and technology companies from 1995 and 2005, including half of the start-ups in Silicon Valley, our high-tech capital. Sergey Brin, Google's co-founder, was born in Moscow but educated in the United States. Google is now used throughout the globe to gather information and advance knowledge. The brain drain, in short, has become the brain gain. It is no surprise that economic interdependence brings new global challenges and educational demands. The United States cannot, acting by itself, dramatically reduce poverty and disease or develop sustainable sources of energy. America alone cannot combat terrorism or curb climate change. To succeed, we must collaborate with other countries. Those new partnerships require American students to develop better critical thinking abilities, cross-cultural understanding, and facility in multiple languages. They also will require U.S. students to strengthen their skills in science, technology, engineering, and math—the STEM fields that anchor much of our innovation in the global economy. These new partnerships must also inspire students to take a bigger and deeper view of their civic obligations—not only to their countries of origin but to the betterment of the global community. A just and socially responsible society must also be anchored in civic engagement for the public good. In our view, the United States will be better off, in comparative terms, if we lead the world in educational attainment, rather than lagging behind. A generation ago, America did in fact lead the world in college attainment. But today among young adults, the U.S. is tied for ninth. That is why President Obama has set a goal that America will once again have the highest proportion of college graduates in the world by 2020, a decade from now. Yet even as the United States works to strengthen its educational system, it is important to remember that advancing educational attainment and achievement everywhere brings benefits not just to the U.S. but around the globe. In the knowledge economy, education is the new game-changer driving economic growth. Education, as Nelson Mandela says, "is the most powerful weapon which you can use to change the world."From Indonesia to Pakistan to Kenya, education has immeasurable power to promote growth and stability. It is absolutely imperative that the United States seize the opportunity to help Haiti build a stronger school system from the ruins of its old, broken one—just as America coalesced to build a fast-improving, vibrant school system in New Orleans after the tragedy of Hurricane Katrina. From devastation, beautiful flowers can grow—crisis can seed opportunities for transformational change. In 2001, Afghanistan had barely 900,000 boys in school. They now have almost seven million children in schools, almost 40 percent of whom are girls. Dramatic change can happen in a short period of time. It just requires the commitment to succeed. Educating girls and integrating them into the labor force is especially critical to breaking the cycle of poverty. It is hard to imagine a better world without a global commitment to providing better education for women and youth—including the 72 million children who do not attend primary school today. And don't forget that a better-educated world would be a safer world, too. Low educational attainment is one of the few statistically significant predictors of violence. My department has been pleased to partner with the U.S. Agency for International Development to help ensure that our best domestic practices are shared world-wide. The United States provides over a billion dollars annually to partner countries working on educational reform. Our goal for the coming year will be to work closely with global partners, including UNESCO, to promote qualitative improvements and system-strengthening. With such a shared commitment, we believe that we can greatly reduce the number of children out of school and ensure that the children who are in class are actually learning. Ultimately, education is the great equalizer. It is the one force that can consistently overcome differences in background, culture, and privilege. As the author Ben Wildavsky writes in his new book, The Great Brain Race, in the global economy "more and more people will have the chance... to advance based on what they know rather than who they are."

#### Middle skills are key to competition – lack of training damages the US middle skills industry.

Milken Institute 15 – The Milken Institute is an independent economic think tank based in Santa Monica, California that publishes research and hosts conferences that apply market-based principles and financial innovations to a variety of societal issues in the US and internationally, 2015 (“Middle-skills gap threatens U.S. competitiveness in the global economy”, Milken Institute, April 30, Available Online at http://www.milkeninstitute.org/blog/view/773, accessed 7/6/15, KM)

To compete in a global economy, the U.S. needs to fill crucial middle-skills jobs in manufacturing, infrastructure, computers, health care and other industries that require post-secondary technical education and training. The problem is that there aren’t enough people who are trained for them. At the Milken Institute Global Conference, leaders in education and business discussed ways to close America’s skills gap. They also pointed to the necessity of addressing the large numbers of minorities and students in disadvantaged communities who are being left behind, a problem which, if left unresolved, could lead to an economic crisis worse than 2008. “The public education system is what needs to change,” said Eloy Ortiz Oakley, superintendent-president of Long Beach City College, whose partnership with the school district and California State University, Long Beach earned a $5 million state grant last month for innovation in higher education. “It is the gateway for the majority of people of color.” Chris Romer, president and co-founder of Quad Learning, Inc., creator of the American Honors college prep program, added that the path to a post-secondary employment certificate is harder for students with less “college knowledge.” To compound the challenge, businesses tend to recruit more from four-year universities than community colleges.

### zIntegrate

#### College research and quality education is key to solve warming

Rubin 13 [Edward Rubin (Professor, Department of Engineering and Public Policy, Department of Mechanical Engineering, Carnegie Mellon University), "Climate Change, Technology Innovation, and the Future of Coal," 6/5/2013] AZ

Resource Needs for Technology Innovation Achieving climate change goals will require not only a set of policy drivers, but also an infusion of financial and human resources to support each stage of the technological change process, especially the innovation stage. This includes the needs for increased R&D support and for people with the requisite training, skills, and creativity to innovate. The outlook for a major infusion of such resources is decidedly mixed. In recent years, for example, China—now the largest emitter of GHGs in the world—has embarked on a major program of investments in “green” energy technologies. This has propelled it to be the world’s leading manufacturer of photovoltaic solar cells, as well as a dominant force in wind power systems. China also is investing heavily in nuclear power and in clean coal technologies, including carbon capture and storage systems. In contrast, government funding for energy R&D in the U.S. has declined sharply over the past three decades, and remains much lower than for other areas of science and technology such as space and health. As a fraction of gross domestic product (GDP) the U.S. also spends substantially less on energy R&D than many other industrialized countries. Reliable data on private-sector funding of energy-related R&D is less readily available. Estimates by the International Energy Agency (IEA) and others indicate that the rate of R&D spending by the energy industry is far below that of other major industries such as pharmaceuticals, biotechnology, and software and computer services. Within the energy sector, the electric power industry generally has the lowest rate of R&D spending as a percentage of sales (a widely used indicator).2 Thus, a significant increase in private-sector investments in R&D will be needed to develop and commercialize new clean coal and other low-emission technologies to address climate change. Government policies must provide the signals and help create the markets needed to stimulate such investments. Technology innovations in the energy sector also will require increased numbers of skilled workers, especially engineers and scientists, in a wide variety of disciplines. Limited data for the U.S. suggests that the energy industry currently has far fewer R&D workers as a percentage of the total workforce than the U.S. industry average. The percentage of U.S. college graduates in engineering fields also has declined significantly over the past two decades.20 Efforts to reverse these trends will be needed. While other countries have more favorable trends, efforts to focus human resources and talent on the problems of climate change also are critical. At the end of the day, it is people who innovate. But government and industry play critical roles in attracting and retaining the best and brightest to address the challenges and create the technologies needed to mitigate climate change and fulfill the true promise of clean coal technology.

### 2NR – A2 Endowments Low

#### Endowments are high now, which supports financial aid and faculty research

Onink 15 [Troy Onink (contributor, CEO of Stratagee.com, a provider of college planning advice to families and college planning software and services for financial advisors), "As College Endowments Gain 15.5%, Harvard Tops List Of 25 Biggest Endowment Funds," Forbes Magazine, 1/29/2015] AZ

Investments in venture capital and domestic equity fueled a 15.5% average gain in college endowments in 2014, according to a study released today. Data gathered from 832 U.S. colleges and universities for the 2014 NACUBO-Commonfund Study of Endowments® (NCSE) show that these institutions’ endowments returned an average of 15.5 percent (net of fees) for the 2014 fiscal year (July 1, 2013 – June 30, 2014) compared with 11.7 percent for the 2013 fiscal year. The 832 institutions participating in this year’s Study represented $516.0 billion in endowment assets. These rising return rates have enabled colleges and universities to increase spending from their endowments to support student financial aid programs, faculty research, and other activities vital to their missions. Domestic equities generated the highest return in FY2014, at 22.8 percent, followed by international equities, at 19.2 percent.

#### Conceded uniqueness on the DA – in the squo, endowments are rapidly growing thanks to donations – the aff derails this growth in funding

## Uniqueness CPs

### Financial Aid CP

#### Public colleges and universities ought to direct 25% of their endowment funds to subsidize the cost of education for students that demonstrate substantial financial aid.

#### Solves

Stratford 16 [Mitchell Stratford (education reporter for POLITICO Pro), "Billion-Dollar Targets," Inside Higher Education, 2/16/2016] AZ

Amid double-digit investment returns and growing public anxiety about student debt and the price of college, members of Congress are reviving their scrutiny of the nation’s richest colleges, an issue that largely was put on hold after the financial crisis in 2008. Earlier this week two congressional committees sent letters to several dozen colleges and universities, seeking a wide range of information about how they manage their endowments and spend endowment funds. Senator Orrin Hatch, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, Representative Kevin Brady, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, and Representative Peter Roskam, chairman of the House Ways and Means Subcommittee on Oversight, wrote to 56 private colleges with endowments larger than $1 billion. “Despite these large and growing endowments, many colleges and universities have raised tuition far in excess of inflation,” wrote the three lawmakers, all Republicans. The committees, they said, are looking into “how colleges and universities are using endowment assets to fulfill their charitable and educational purposes.” They instructed colleges to respond by April 1. The letters follow a congressional hearing last fall in which House Republicans criticized large university endowments and executive compensation in higher education. Representative Tom Reed of New York, a Republican, plans to introduce legislation that would require colleges with endowments of more than $1 billion to pay out 25 percent of their annual earnings to reduce the cost of attendance for “working families,” those earning between 100 and 600 percent of the poverty line, according to a fact sheet provided by his office. If colleges were to cover the entire cost for those families with endowment earnings left over, they would then have to direct the money to reducing the cost of attendance for low-income families.